

10 78

BUSH

ON

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Edward P. Small

THE

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST;

IN ANSWER

TO THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

HE ROSE IN A SPIRITUAL AND CELESTIAL,

OR IN

A MATERIAL AND EARTHLY BODY.

BY GEORGE BUSH,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE NEW-YORK CITY UNIVERSITY.

NEW-YORK:

J. S. REDFIELD, CLINTON HALL.

1845.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by
GEORGE BUSH,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of
New-York.

J. F. TROW & CO., PRINTERS,
No. 33 ANN-STREET.

THE substance of the ensuing Essay was originally delivered as a Lecture, prepared as an answer to some severe strictures made in one of the pulpits of the city on that part of my work on the Resurrection, which treats of this subject. This fact will account for the air of reply and remonstrance, which more or less pervades the volume. In its present form the argument has been much expanded, and the sources of evidence multiplied.



THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

WITH no true believer in the Revelation which God has given, can it be for a moment questioned that the doctrine of the *Resurrection* stands prominent and pre-eminent among the disclosures of that sacred volume. The dark guessings of the ancient philosophies—the dim intimations—the uncertain hopes—the timorous deductions—of the universal reason—that *man*, in his essential being, shall survive the triumphs of the tomb, and possess immortal life, are all confirmed, authenticated, and assured to his faith, by the teachings of Him, who “hath brought life and immortality to light.” Upon the impregnable rock of the same authority stands the asserted fact of the resurrection of Christ himself, who rose “as the first fruits of them that slept.” The fact of our resurrection is indissolubly connected with that of his, with only those differences which must necessarily accrue, in the nature of the case, from the difference that separates man from the God-man. The great mystery of godliness—“God manifest in the flesh”—the true constitution of the theanthropic person of Christ, we assume not to fathom. We receive it as an ultimate fact, resting upon the sole authority of the inspired word, that in the economy of redemption, the

Divinity came into union with the humanity, and tabernacled in the flesh. We receive it, also, that this Divine Person died on the cross, so far as he could die, and that he rose from the dead as truly as he died. So far we are occupying ground common to all evangelical Christians. With them, also, we fully agree in the importance of this fact, as the great central truth of Christianity, and the demonstrated pledge of the doctrine of the resurrection of the saints. The return to life on the third day of the august Lord of life, ever has been, and ever is to be, the assured seal and earnest of the living again of those who have slept in Jesus. But how far the resurrection of Christ is to be regarded as an *exact pattern* of the resurrection of the saints, can only be determined by determining how far, from the *nature* of each, the conditions of the one *could* find a parallel in those of the other. It is certain that the body of Christ did not "see corruption." It is certain that the bodies of the saints *do* see corruption. This establishes at once an immeasurable diversity, in this respect, between the two. In the one case, a body is made the subject of a change called resurrection, while its organic integrity remains unimpaired; in the other, if the common view be admitted, bodies which have been dissolved, dissipated, and formed into countless new combinations, are to be reconstructed, and vivified anew by their respective souls or spirits, and thus made to live again as the *identical* bodies which died. If this be not the commonly received view, we would gladly be informed what it is.

Again, it is clear that the divino-human constitution of our Lord's person *must* be the ground of an immense difference in the conditions of his state and that of *ours*

people, both after and before his resurrection. We can not justly reason from the one to the other. It does not follow, that because man, from the laws of his nature, goes into a resurrection-state as soon as he dies, without reference to his gross material body, that the same holds good of the risen Jesus. Nor can any thing be more unjust than to attach such a consequence to a train of reasoning designed to show that the true doctrine of the resurrection of mankind does not involve or imply the resurrection of the same body.

The question, then, comes fairly for consideration respecting the *nature* of Christ's resurrection, and the *quality* of the body with which he emerged from the tomb of Joseph, and in which he appeared, from time to time, during the forty days previous to the ascension from the Mount of Olives. In determining this question, we readily admit that our only source of information is the inspired oracles. Reason and science are utterly at fault in the attempt to solve a problem which involves the nature and laws of that existence upon which He entered at his resurrection, who says so sublimely of himself, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." We are thrown entirely upon the disclosures of revelation for the needed light upon this subject, and by the teachings of that word we readily abide. What is its testimony?

Before entering upon the inquiry, it may be well to advert to an objection of somewhat grave character urged against the evangelical narrative of the resurrection of Christ, founded upon the fact, that it was not strictly a *public event* so ordered as to have been universally or generally visible. So far from this having been

the case, we are expressly told by Peter, Acts, 10 : 40, 41, that though God had raised him up on the third day, and in a certain sense had shown him "openly," yet "not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him, after he rose from the dead." Now, as our Lord's resurrection was designed to be the grand and crowning proof of the truth of his mission and his religion, why was the evidence of this great fact confined within such narrow limits? Why was not a broader blazon given to it? Why did he not after his resurrection appear openly to the chief priests and rulers of the Jews? Why not to the body of the people? As his commission related in an especial manner to them—as he says of himself, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"—why should not the main credentials of his mission be laid before them, who were mainly concerned in the evidence of its divinity?

These interrogations will seem reasonable to those to whom the demand of the Jews, at his crucifixion, would have seemed reasonable: "If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him." This differed in reality but little from saying, that if the Saviour by coming down from the cross, and foregoing crucifixion, would prove that he was *not* the Christ, they would believe that he *was*. Every part of his work, to its minutest details, was the accomplishment of a profound plan of infinite wisdom, which often orders its procedures in a method directly *opposite* to that which would have been adopted by the carnal, narrow, and short-sighted wisdom of man. Yet, in a deeper scanning of the Divine

counsels, we frequently find our own limited conclusions rebuked by the obvious propriety of the course which we learn to have been actually chosen by Him who "sees the end from the beginning." In the present case it is clear, that, although our Lord's commission had indeed embraced a special and primary reference to the Jews, yet it included also a higher and wider designation, which was to be developed upon his rejection by those to whom he originally came. While he was indeed the Messiah promised to the Jews, he was also appointed to be the great High Priest and Saviour of the world. During his lifetime he had by his miracles and teachings afforded all requisite evidence of the truth of his claims. He had fed the famishing, healed the sick, and raised the dead. He had done the works which no man could do unless God, in a pre-eminent sense, were with him. They were, therefore, left without excuse, and the multiplication of miracles beyond a certain point would be merely accumulating the grounds of condemnation. It would be little else than intensifying the light which, through their own perverseness, was putting out their eyes. Accordingly, in his last public address to the people, Matt. 23. 37-39, he says, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

This was a virtual closing his commission to that

unbelieving people. What farther claim could they prefer to the demonstrations of his Messiahship? "Ye shall not see me henceforth" was the knell of their destiny. As to appearing to them again after his resurrection, it was utterly inconsistent with this assurance. They were not to see him, as a people, after his death, till they could see him with blessings on their lips.

The resurrection was to be henceforth the basis of a new and wider relation which the Saviour was to sustain to the world at large. It was in connexion with this event that "all power was to be given to him in heaven and on earth." He was now to be raised to the dignity of an ecumenical kingdom. The disciples, no longer restricted to the bounds of Jewry, were to go and "teach all nations." The evidences of the great fact of the resurrection of Christ, therefore, concerned that people in no especial manner. It were quite as fitting that he should subsequently have manifested himself to the members of the Roman Senate, as to those of the Jewish Sanhedrim, as the Roman empire was henceforth to become the grand theatre for the proclamation of the good tidings which were to be assured to "all people" on the ground of the certified fact of the Lord's resurrection. The apostles were chosen to be witnesses of this fact, because they were appointed as heralds to announce it to the world, and if any kind of incompetency could be for a moment supposed to detract from the value of their testimony, the idea is at once counter-vailed by the words of Peter, Acts 5: 32, "And we are his witnesses of these things; *and so is also the Holy Ghost*, whom God hath given to them that obey him." The co-witnessing power of the Holy Spirit was a pledge

of the truth of their verbal testimony, for it is not conceivable that he should have imparted his influences to confirm a lie.

It is evident, therefore, that the divine wisdom can be in no measure impugned on the score of the publicity of the circumstances attending the resurrection of Christ. There were ample reasons for restricting the number of the witnesses—reasons which applied to the ascension as well as to the resurrection; for it appears that the ascension itself was not strictly a public miracle. Though the scene of it was in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, yet it is never appealed to as an event that was openly visible in the view of the inhabitants, nor is there the least evidence that it was witnessed by any but a select number of disciples.

The great question, then, concerns the real character of the event itself, and the nature of the body in which our Lord arose. The complete discussion of this subject would, perhaps, properly involve the consideration of the various details of the resurrection, as related by the different evangelists, and which involve some apparent discrepancies of statement. But the recent essay of Prof. Robinson (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. II. No. V., Feb. 1845), with a view to harmonize the accounts, I regard as, on the whole, so able and satisfactory that it will be sufficient to refer the reader to his results, which, with the exception of particular inferences here and there, I cordially adopt. So far as he endeavors to show that the resurrection of Christ was the resurrection of his unchanged material body, I differ from him entirely, and hope to prove that I have valid grounds for so doing.

§ I. *First Appearance.*

Matt. 28: 1-8. Mark 16: 1-8. Luke 24: 1, 11. John 20: 1, 2.

The first visitants to the sepulchre on the morning of the third day, were a company of women who came with spices to embalm the Lord's body. They found the stone rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre, and entering in perceived that the body was not there, and a moment after were accosted by two angels in human form, and in shining garments, who asked them why they sought the living among the dead, and then went on to inform them that Christ was risen according as he had said, and to command them to go quickly and communicate the fact to his disciples, together with an assurance that he would meet them in Galilee. In regard to these incidents, it is worthy of notice that the angels appear to have been invisible when the women first entered the sepulchre, though it was undoubtedly a small excavated apartment in the rock. The narrative informs us that they "entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments." Now, what we would have especially noticed in this connexion is, that in a small room they should have stood some time perplexed on finding it vacated of the body, and yet not have seen two angels in glittering robes if they had been actually there in visible forms. Would they not have been the very first objects to strike their vision, had they been actually there in a form and aspect to be seen? No one can imagine for a moment that they entered the sepulchre from without after the women went in. What, then, is the infer-

ence? What can we conclude but that the angels were, in some sense, previously there, and that they were now miraculously made visible, and that, too, by a subjective miraculous effect, wrought upon the women themselves, whose spiritual eyes were opened to discern these beings of a spiritual rank? But even if this solution be questioned for the present, still, here is the palpable fact of the sudden and miraculous revelation of two spiritual bodies to the astonished sight of the women, which they did not see upon their first entrance into the tomb. The fact shows, at any rate, that a spiritual body may become, in some way, suddenly visible. A very similar incident is recorded in Acts 1. 10, "And while they looked steadfastly towards heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel." It is not improbable that these were the same two angels that had previously appeared to the women, and subsequently to Mary Magdalene, but whether they were or not, it is clear that the apparition was equally sudden. Nothing is said of their previous descent from heaven, but the first intimation they had of their coming was their actual presence in the midst of them, or standing by their side. How natural the inference that the inward eyes of the disciples were now opened to behold them! But we proceed with the narrative.

§ II. *Second Appearance.**

John 20 : 3-18. Luke 24 : 12. Mark 16 : 9-11.

The women, with the exception of Mary Magdalene,

* In Mark, 16 : 9, it is said of the appearance to Mary Magdalene that it was the *first* : "Now being risen early the first day of

who seems to have run immediately back without waiting for her company to inform Peter and John, return

the week, he appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene." The mode in which this statement is made to harmonize with Matthew's account of the appearance to the other women on their return from the sepulchre, which Prof. Robinson has adopted, we think to be the true one. It is thus stated: "Mark narrates three and only three appearances of our Lord; of these three that to Mary Magdalene takes place *first* (πρῶτον), and that to the assembled disciples the same evening occurs last (ὑστερον), v. 14. Now in any series or succession of events where πρῶτον and ὑστερον are employed, whatever may be the number of intervening terms, πρῶτον marks the first of the series, and ὑστερον the last of the same series, and no other. So here in Mark, ὑστερον is put with the third appearance narrated; but had four been mentioned, ὑστερον could not have stood with the third, but must have been used with the fourth or last; and so in every case.* Hence as ὑστερον is here put relatively, and therefore does not exclude the subsequent appearance of our Lord to Thomas and in Galilee; so too πρῶτον stands relatively, and does not exclude the previous appearance to the other women. A similar example occurs in 1 Cor. 15: 5-8, where Paul enumerates those to whom the Lord showed himself after his resurrection, viz.: to Peter, to the twelve, to five hundred brethren, to James, to all the apostles, and *last of all* (ὑστατον πάντων) to Paul also. Now had Paul written here, as with strict propriety he might have done, "he was seen *first* of Cephas" ὡφθη πρῶτον Κηφᾶ, assuredly no one would ever have understood him as intending to assert that the appearance to Peter was the first absolutely; that is, as implying that Jesus was seen of Peter before he appeared to Mary Magdalene and the other women. In like manner when John declares (21: 14) that Jesus showed himself to his disciples by the lake of Galilee for the *third* time after he was risen from the dead; this is said relatively to the two previous appearances to the assembled apostles; and does by no means exclude the four still earlier appearances, viz.: to Peter, to the two at Emmaus, to Mary Magdalene, and to the other women—one of which John himself relates in full. In this way the

* See for this use of ὑστερον, Matt. 21: 37. 22: 27. 26: 60.

to the city to give the commanded information to the disciples, and on the way the Saviour meets them with the kindly salutation, "All hail!" and they at once hold him by the feet and worship him. He repeats the order that they shall convey the intelligence of his resurrection to the disciples, and renew the direction for them to repair to Galilee, where he would meet them.

Here, again, we cannot fail to note somewhat of a sudden and marvellous apparition. Though somewhere, doubtless, in the midst of the city, and liable to be seen as he passed, if in a material body, yet the clear intimation is, that no one else saw him; and the inference would seem to be, that his appearance was just as sudden and of the same nature with that of the angels at the tomb. But of this we shall adduce more evidence in the sequel.

Mary Magdalene, after having delivered her message to Peter and John, returns with them by another route to the sepulchre, and without having yet seen the Lord. She remains standing outside while the two disciples, one after the other, enter the sepulchre and find nothing but the clothes lying. They come out and return home, leaving Mary in tears at the entrance of the tomb. After their departure, without entering, she stoops down and looks into the sepulchre, and to her surprise beholds two angels in white sitting, the one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain! Now let it be here observed, that Peter and John had but a few moments before been into the sepulchre, and

whole difficulty in the case before us disappears; and the complex and cumbrous machinery of earlier commentators becomes superfluous." *Bibl. Sac.*, No. V. Feb. 1845, p. 178.

saw nothing but the grave-clothes lying on the floor. But Mary looks in immediately after, and lo, the two angels appear to her ! What shall we infer from this ? Is it not evident that the angels, though they remained invisible to Peter and John, yet now made themselves visible to Mary ?—consequently that they could become visible or invisible at pleasure ?

In saying that the angels were previously *there*, I would of course be understood as using language in accommodation to those natural ideas of which it is so difficult to divest ourselves, rather than according to the absolute verity of the case. It is a mode of speech which seems to imply some kind of relation, on the part of the angels, to locality or space which we cannot strictly assume to exist. It does not necessarily follow, because an angel appears to the spiritual vision of a man, that therefore his previous *local* relations, so to speak, to that man have undergone a change. The truth is, we are here getting beyond our depth. We can form no idea of *locality* in reference to spirits. It is not necessary to suppose, as it is not possible to prove, that an angel in heaven may not appear to the internal sense of a man on earth, and still be as much in heaven at the time as before ; for heaven can only be correctly conceived of as abstracted from time and space.

As to the mode in which the appearance was now made to Mary, the supposition of the unconscious development of a spiritual sense in the spectator affords the most probable solution of the problem. It is a question scarcely yet considered in man's philosophy, whether the human eye *can* see any thing that is not material. If an angel is seen in human form, it must either be converted to a human being, with its solid organisms, or it must be

seen as it is by an internal eye, adapted to take cognizance of spiritual objects. Which is the most probable, I leave to my readers to judge. I am well aware that this idea of the opening of a spiritual eye is not very familiar to the mass even of serious minds, at the present day, and, accordingly, does not probably present itself very distinctly to their conceptions. It may be well to cite an illustrative instance. In the Israelitish story, 2 Kings 6. 17, we meet with the following incident; "And Elisha prayed and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw; and behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." Here was the opening of the eye of the spirit, for we cannot imagine that his outward eye had been previously closed. If any one demands the philosophy or psychology of this, I cannot explain it. But I take the simple recorded fact, that there is some form of the divine power exerted upon the inner intelligence of man, by which he is made cognizant of a class of objects which we term spiritual, and which, in their own nature, lie wholly out of the natural or material sphere, and which cannot, by any possibility, be discerned by an organ designed exclusively for converse with the material world. At the same time, I can easily conceive, what I believe to be the fact, that the subject of such vision shall not, from his consciousness, be able to know but that these objects are seen in the same way that any other objects are seen. As this is a point of no small moment in reference to the general subject, I shall dwell upon it a little more at length.

Angelic appearances, we well know, are often mentioned in the Scriptures, and most readers are una-

ware of any difficulty in regard to the *mode* in which such manifestations were made. But to a close consideration of the subject there *are* peculiar difficulties. An angel is confessedly a spirit; but a spirit cannot be seen, in his true nature, by the visual organs of man. If an angel, therefore, becomes visible to a man, it must be in one of two ways: either by means of a change in the conditions of the spirit, or by a change in the perceptive powers of the man. In the latter case it is by the process spoken of above, to wit, the opening of a spiritual eye, which is but another term for that peculiar intellectual state into which the prophets were brought, when favored with supernatural visions. The fact of such a state can be easily conceived, though we may never have consciously experienced it ourselves. But when we turn to the other view and examine it narrowly, we become aware of difficulties which did not strike us at first blush. What is the nature of the change which a spirit must undergo in order to be made visible to the human eye? It is common to say that he assumes the appearance of a human being. But what is meant by this? An *appearance* generally denotes the opposite of *reality*. We should hardly understand by the *appearance* of a human body such a body itself. We can imagine a statue of wood or marble moulded into a human form, and such an *appearance* might easily be seen. Still we should not say it was a human being. So we can say, also, that a cloud might be wrought into the shape of a man, and we might see it—for a cloud, though a rare substance, is yet material and therefore visible. But when we come to think of an angel having the appearance of a man, we are stumbled at once by the difficulties of the supposition. If it is merely an *appearance*,

is the angel in that *appearance*? Imagine for instance an angel appearing in a human form in the air. If you see such a form with the natural eye, it must be something which is visible, and therefore material. What is it? If you say it is the spiritual essence of an angel drawing around it an atmospheric body, of the form of the human body, then it must be something grosser than the pure ether, for this cannot be seen. Now we cannot, perhaps, deny that this is intrinsically possible, but we think the recorded instances of such manifestations would lead to a different impression. We should not imagine, I believe, that the angels which appeared to the patriarchs were mere aerial spectres. They did not appear in the air, but on the earth. They approached the spectators—they conversed with them—they are said, on one occasion at least, to have ate and drank with them—and all the circumstances compel the inference, either that they were actually *transformed* into veritable human beings, or that the miracle was wrought in the beholders, by which they were preternaturally enabled to see them; and this is, in my own view, by far the most credible hypothesis.

An opinion, however, is of little account apart from the reasons by which it is sustained. We believe, indeed, that few minds are exempt from an instinctive conviction of the *improbability* of a *bona fide* transformation of an angelic into a human being. But we find evidence of a different kind. The idea above suggested, we think to be very strongly confirmed by the legitimate import of the language employed in reference to angelic manifestations. The usage of the original on this subject is altogether peculiar, and opens a field of philological deduction, of the importance of

which biblical students appear to have been hitherto very little aware. It may, I think, be clearly made to appear that there is an *appropriated form of expression* in relation to the whole subject of *theophanies* and *angelophanies*, which has been almost entirely overlooked by critics and commentators, but the results of which must inevitably put a new phasis upon a whole class of texts bearing upon this theme, both in the Old and the New Testaments. It can undoubtedly be shown that the post-resurrection appearances of our Lord belong to the department of the scriptural *theophanies*, and we shall moreover see, if we mistake not, that the soundest canons of hermeneutics absolutely compel the conclusion, that the various passages which announce the second advent of our Lord, cannot possibly be understood of what is generally termed a *visible personal manifestation*, such as can be taken cognizance of by the natural or outward eye. But the proof of this we reserve to a subsequent page. Our object at present is to unfold the diction which occurs in reference to the appearance of angels.

To those who are conversant with the original languages of Scripture it is well known that there is a number of distinct terms which are promiscuously rendered by our English "to see." Thus we have in the Hebrew the two leading terms רָאָה and חָזַק , of which the former is the prevailing term for common and natural vision, while the latter חָזַק and its derivatives are more especially appropriated to that interior mental vision which was peculiar to the prophets, whence חֹזֶה is used to designate a *prophet* or *seer*, and חֲזוֹן *prophetic vision*. Thus Gesenius, as translated by Professor Robinson, gives as one of the leading senses of חָזַק , "what is presented,

by a divine influence, to the prophet's mind, either in visions, properly so called, or in revelations, oracles, etc., as Hab. 1. 1, 'The oracle which Habakkuk saw,' i. e. which was divinely presented to his mind, which was revealed." It is indeed true that these senses are occasionally interchanged with each other, and that הִרְאָה is applied to *mental*, and הִבִּיט to *ocular* vision. But it is, nevertheless, undeniably the fact, that what I have stated is the *dominant* usage in regard to these two terms. Thus, for instance, throughout the visions of Daniel, where he speaks of *seeing* or *beholding* the visions of the supernatural diorama spread before him, the term is invariably הִבִּיט .

In like manner the Greek, also, has a striking diversity of terms, though greater, to express the idea of "seeing." Thus we find $\epsilonἶδω$, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$, $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and $\omicron\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, all rendered "see," and though occasionally their meanings run into each other, yet there is no doubt that a *prevailing* usage can be ascertained in regard to each. The last in the list above given, $\omicron\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, is the term which the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers generally applies to angelic appearances, as also to the divine *theophanies*, mentioned in the Old Testament. Though applied in repeated instances to external vision, particularly in the Septuagint, yet it is capable of absolute demonstration, that of all the different terms for "seeing," it is this which is more especially used to denote that internal or intellectual perception which is expressed by the Hebrew הִבִּיט , of which it is in several instances the Greek rendering, and which was developed in the prophets, when made the subjects of supernatural revelations. This usage we now proceed to illustrate by a copious list of examples :

Gen. 12. 7, "And the Lord *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto Abraham, and said, etc.,—and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who *appeared* (ὀφθέντι) unto him."

This, of course, could not be an appearance made to the outward organ of vision, because in this sense our Saviour declares, John 1. 18, "No man *hath seen* (ἑώρακε) God at any time," which is reiterated by the apostle, 1 Tim. 6. 16, "Whom no man *hath seen* (εἶδεν) or *can see*" (ιδεῖν). Yet in another sense we find this very term applied to the vision of God, Mat. 5. 5, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall *see God* (ὀψονται τον Θεόν)."

Gen. 35. 9, "And God *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto Jacob again, when he came out of Padan-aram."

Ex. 3. 2, "And the angel of the Lord *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto him in a flame of fire."

Judg. 6. 12, "And the angel of the Lord *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto him."

" 13. 3, "And the angel of the Lord *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto the woman."

1 Kings 3. 5, "In Gibeon the Lord *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto Solomon in a dream by night."

Luke 1. 11, "And there *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto him an angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar."

" 22. 43, "And there *appeared* (ὤφθην) an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him."

Acts 7. 30, "And when forty years were expired, there *appeared* (ὤφθην) to him in the wilderness of Mount Sinai an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush."

" 7. 35, "The same did God send to be a ruler and deliverer by the hand of the angel which *appeared* (ὀφθέντος) to him in the bush."

Rev. 11. 19, "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there *was seen* (ὡφθῆ) in his temple the ark of his testament." This is, of course, an intellectual vision. So also that which follows.

Rev. 12. 1, "And there *appeared* (ᾤφθῆ) a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun," etc. It is clear, therefore, that this is the proper term to express that kind of sight which was accorded to the prophets in their ecstasies.

The only question that can arise in regard to these and a multitude of similar cases is, whether the *appearing* spoken of was made to the outward or the inward eye. This question must be determined by an appeal to the prevailing usage in regard to the term. In the following passages, taken exclusively from the New Testament, it will be obvious that the "seeing" indicated by the term is a seeing by the eye of the mind, and not of the body.

Luke 3. 16, "And all flesh shall *see* (ὄψεται) the salvation of God."

" 17. 22, "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye *shall not see* (οὐκ ὄψεσθε) it."

John 3. 36, "He that believeth not the Son, shall not *see* (ὄψεται) life."

Rom. 5. 21, "To whom he was not spoken of, they *shall see* (ὄψονται), and they that have not heard shall understand."

Heb. 12. 14, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man *shall see* (ὄψεται) the Lord."

In all these cases the import is that of *mental* or *spiritual vision*. Guided by this clew we may assign to the same class the vision of Christ with Moses and Elias

at the transfiguration, whom we conceive there is no reason to suppose they beheld with the natural eye.

Mat. 17. 3, "And behold, there *appeared* (ᾤφθησαν) unto them Moses and Elias talking with him."

Luke 9. 31, 32, "And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias; who *appeared* (ᾤφθησαν) in glory and spake of his decease."

So also of the event announced by our Saviour in the following passage, which we conceive is to be interpreted of a similar kind of vision.

John 1. 5, "And he saith unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter ye *shall see* (ὄψεσθε) heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."

Thus, too, of the miracle of the cloven tongues.

Acts 2. 3, "And there *appeared* (ᾤφθησαν) unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them."

From the general usage of the term, we infer that it has here the import, not of a bodily, but of a mental vision. Not but that the effect produced upon the internal sensorium was to their consciousness the same as if an external object had been present to produce it, but our position still is, that such an object was *not* present, but that the perception was the result of an immediate exertion of divine power.

Acts 2. 17, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men *shall see visions* (ὀράσεις ὄψονται), and your old men shall dream dreams." The Greek ὀράσεις denotes a mental and not an ocular vision.

Rev. 9. 17, "And thus I saw the horses *in the vision* (ἐν τῇ ὁράσει)."

I have already remarked that the verb ὀπτομαι is occasionally used to denote common ocular vision, but out of fifty-seven cases in which the word occurs in the New Testament, the following are the only ones in which it will bear that import.

Mat. 27. 4, "What is that to us? *See thou* (ὄψει) to that." This might as properly, perhaps, come under the preceding head, but we concede every text that is possible. So, also, Acts 18. 15.

Luke 13. 28, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye *shall see* (ὄψεσθε) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of heaven." As this, however, was to be a vision in the spiritual world, it might be properly contended that it was to be seen by a spiritual eye.

John 11. 40, "Said I not unto thee, that if thou wouldst believe thou shouldst *see* (ὄψει) the glory of God." This is, perhaps, more correctly understood of a mental recognition.

"16. 16, "A little while, and ye shall not *see* (θεωρεῖτε) me, and again a little while and ye shall *see* (ὄψεσθε) me." So, also, v. 17, 19. This is somewhat remarkable, as the term for *seeing* in the two clauses is varied. Whether the latter term was intended to intimate the *peculiar kind of seeing* which would be requisite after his resurrection, we will not here positively affirm, but certain it is that this is the very word, in its passive form, by which his manifestations to his disciples were indicated, as we shall see in what follows.

Acts 7. 26, "And the next day he *showed himself*

(ᾤφθη—*appeared, was seen*) unto them as they strove.”

Acts 20. 25, “ I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, *shall see* (ὄψεσθε) my face no more.”

Heb. 13. 23, “ With whom, if he come shortly, *I will see* (ὄψομαι) you.”

Here are eight instances out of fifty-seven in which we do not refuse to admit that the original ὀπτομαι indicates ocular vision. The remaining forty-nine constitute so strong an array of proofs in support of the other sense, that we see not why our asserted distinction is not made out. If so, we certainly have good grounds for the position, that *the angelic appearances recorded in Scripture were not made to the natural eye*. But to this species of proof we shall have occasion to revert again hereafter.

The weeping Mary, after being addressed by the angels in the sepulchre, turned herself around, and lo! the Lord himself suddenly stood by her side in an aspect which led her to mistake him for the gardener. As such she addressed him, and it was only in the hidden power which accompanied the utterance of her name “ Mary ” that she recognized the truth of his person, and at once responded, with a transport of emotion, in the endearing appellation “ Rabboni.” All the circumstances indicate an apparition as instantaneous and miraculous as that of the angels within the tomb, and as she had doubtless just had her mental eye couched to behold *them*, why shall we not suppose that it was in virtue of that inward change that she was enabled to behold *him*? If he was now in a gross human body, where had he been in the interval since his emergence

from the tomb? He had previously appeared, it seems, to the company of the returning women in the city, and shall we suppose that he had been walking the streets in the mean time, and now came up to the door of the sepulchre like any other being of flesh and blood? We would ask if this is credible? Do we not instinctively reject the idea? Is it not, on the contrary, the far more obvious and spontaneous impression wrought in the mind of the common reader, that this appearance was strictly supernatural, and such as would be understood of a spiritualized instead of a material body?

It will perhaps be admitted that there was *something* miraculous in the phenomena of our Lord's post-resurrection appearances—that he had power to conceal himself, when he pleased, from human vision—and again to make himself visible. And that perhaps, during the whole space of the forty days, he was *most* of the time invisible. We would inquire what is the real meaning to be attached to this concession? Does it not virtually imply the very thing for which we are contending? It appears, as near as we can determine from the evangelic narrative, that he appeared eleven times during the lapse of this forty days, and it would seem that the time of each interview was short. Suppose we allow three hours to each, here are thirty-three hours out of forty days in which we will say that he appeared in a human body of flesh and bones. Where and in what condition was he during the remainder of the time? Was he on the earth? How did he subsist? With whom did he sojourn? By whom was he seen? These are all fair and legitimate questions on the ground of the common theory. There is certainly no evidence that he was publicly seen during that time. Indeed we have ex-

press assurance to the contrary in the words of Peter to the family of Cornelius, the centurion: "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῇ γενέσθαι); not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God!" The original has it, "gave him to become visible," which certainly implies a peculiar *empowering* of the spectators to behold him. The language is such as would be very natural on the ground of the truth of our supposition. It was then only to selected witnesses that he became visible, and that too at intervals. The presumption undoubtedly is, that he was invisible because he was in a spiritual state—that *from* this state he appeared from time to time, just as an angel appears. The difference between the two theories is, that in the one case the virtue of the miracle was in making himself visible, in the other, of making himself invisible. The one supposes the *prevailing* state during the forty days to have been terrestrial and material, from which, however, he went into, and for the most part remained in, a spiritual condition; the other deems the *prevailing* state to have been spiritual and celestial, from which he occasionally became visible, and even then not by any miraculous change in himself, but by means of a subjective effect wrought in the spectators, by which they were enabled to perceive him in whatever form he was pleased to exhibit himself, whether in that of a gardener, of an ordinary traveller, or his crucified and wounded body. These are the two alternatives, and considering the nature of the evidence in regard to each, I do not perceive that the advocates of either are authorized to use harsh language of those of the other. It is a point on which honest minds may honestly differ, without laying any

just foundation for mutual distrust or crimination, much less *denunciation*.

§ III. *Third Appearance.*

Mark 16. 12. Luke 24. 13-35. 1 Cor. 15. 5.

The next appearance related is that to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, on the afternoon of the same day on which he rose. This is spoken of very briefly by Mark as follows: "After that he appeared to two of them in another form (ἐν ἑτέρῃ μορφῇ) as they walked and went into the country." Mark 16. 12. Luke relates the incident far more minutely, ch. 24. 13-35, "And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden, that they should not know him. And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering, said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have re-

deemed Israel : and besides all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre : and when they found not his body, they came, saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said ; but him they saw not. Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken ! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory ? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went : and he made as though he would have gone further. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us ; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him ; and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures ? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread." The one evangelist informs us that he appeared "in another form" (ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ), the other that "their eyes were holden that they

should not know him." The question occurs, what is meant by "another form" in this connexion. Some have understood it of his garb—that he was now in a different dress from that in which he had been familiarly known to them, and that for this reason they did not recognize him. But the word is not elsewhere used in this sense, and besides it is difficult to conceive that a mere difference of garment should have prevented them from recognizing a person whom they well knew, if there was no change in his countenance and voice, especially as he walked with them some distance and conversed freely with them all the time. It is not possible, we think, to resist the evidence that there was a far greater change than this. The implication we take to be that it was a "different form" from that in which he had previously appeared. He had appeared to Mary at first in a form which led her to mistake him for a gardener, though he afterwards revealed himself in his true character. *Her* eyes, therefore, might be said to be at first comparatively holden, but to be fully opened when she exclaimed, "Rabboni." It was only by a spiritual eye, indeed, that she beheld him at all, as was the case with the two disciples when he appeared as a wayfaring man in their company, but in both instances a further and fuller revelation was subsequently granted. Their eyes were *so far* opened that they had a more adequate recognition of his true person, for we see nothing to forbid the idea of different degrees of this supernatural vision. They at first took him simply for what he was in appearance, a common traveller, which we know at the same time was not his *true* form, for this was spiritual and not natural. Is not this obvious from what follows? "And it came to pass as he sat at meat

with them, he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. *And their eyes were opened*, and he vanished out of their sight." What is clearer than that this does not refer to their natural organs of sight, but to an interior mental or spiritual perception by which alone they were able to "discern the Lord's body?" Here, then, we have the most unequivocal assurance that it was by means of an inward subjective change in themselves that, on this occasion, they were enabled to recognize the Saviour in his resurrection-person. And if it was so on this occasion, why not also on others? Why shall we not also suppose that it was in precisely the same way that he appeared to Mary at the tomb, and to her companions in the city, and that it was also in the same way that they had seen the angels whose nature, as spiritual beings, is so much akin to that of our Lord in his resurrection-state? We insist upon the similarity of the vision in the two cases, not only from its intrinsic probability, but also from the express language of the sacred record.

In the conversation on the way to Emmaus, above alluded to, the disciples say: "Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; and when they found not his body, they came saying, that they had also seen a *vision* of angels, which said that he was alive." Now the term for *vision* in the original (ὄπτασις) is a term which is *never* in the Scriptures employed in reference to the ordinary sight of the natural eye. It is *always* applied to that kind of *supernatural vision* by which the prophets and apostles, in their ecstatic trances, beheld the angels and other objects of the spiritual world. Thus Paul, speaking of the Lord's appearing to him on the way to

Damascus, which certainly was not an appearance of his material body, nor one made to his outward eye, for his companions travelling with him saw nothing of the kind, says to King Agrippa, "Wherefore, O King, I was not disobedient to the heavenly *vision* (ὄπτασις)," the same word that we have before us. So again, 2 Cor. 12. 1, "It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory; I will come to *visions* (ὄπτασις) and revelations of the Lord." He then goes on to speak of being caught up to the third heaven, where he saw and heard unutterable things. Nobody will say that this was a vision accorded to the eye of his body, for he tells us that he did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body. The only other instance in which the word occurs is Luke 1. 22, respecting Zachariah: "And when he came out he could not speak unto them: and they perceived that he had seen *a vision* (ὄπτασιν) in the temple." That this was a vision seen by the inward and not by the outward eye, is to be inferred from what we have seen to be elsewhere the uniform sense of the word, and also from the fact that the incident is recorded in v. 11, in the language which we have seen to be appropriate to the Scriptural *angelophanies*: "And there *appeared* (ὤφθη) unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense."

Here, then, we have a term employed in reference to these women which denotes, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that they saw not the angels with their natural eyes, and we have also the express assurance that in the case of the two disciples it was by the opening of their inward eye that they were enabled to recognize the Lord in his true person; and what inference can we possibly draw, but that the bodies both of the angels and

the Saviour, were alike spiritual and celestial, and could not be seen by the gross organs of the flesh? The same conclusion follows from its being said that "he vanished out of their sight," or as the letter of the original has it, "he became invisible" (*ἀφαντος ἐγένετο*). Does this mean that he took his departure out of the door like a being of flesh and blood? So says Mr. Barnes in his Commentary: "It does not appear that there was any thing miraculous in this; but during their surprise, he took the opportunity suddenly to withdraw himself." Now is not this doing obvious violence to language? Does not every unbiassed reader take the impression that it was a sudden and supernatural disappearance on the spot from human view? And here, in opposition to Mr. Barnes, we are happy to avail ourselves of a concession of Dr. Robinson, one of the most strenuous assertors of the resurrection of the material body, who in his recent able article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, says of the incident we are now considering, that the idea of our Lord's appearing in another dress is "all hypothesis;" and that "the averment of Luke, that their eyes were holden, and the manner of our Lord's parting from them afterwards, seem more naturally to imply, that the idea of a supernatural agency, *affecting not Jesus himself, but the eyes or minds of the two disciples*, was in the mind of the sacred writer." We have here the clear admission of the great principle for which we contend, of a subjective change in the vision of the witnesses of the resurrection-body of Christ, and our only surprise is, that as this idea solves all the difficulties of the case, the writer did not adopt it throughout.

The original *ἀφαντος*, it is true, occurs nowhere else in the Scriptures, but lexicographers remark that there

is no difference in import between this and ἄφανής which is several times applied in the Old Testament to the sudden disappearance of angels. Thus, 2 Macc. 3. 34, “And having spoken thus, they (the angels) *appeared no more* (ἀφανεῖς ἐγένοντο).” Here, then, we are undoubtedly taught that our Lord suddenly and miraculously disappeared from the view of the disciples. He vanished in the breaking of bread. And this act is explained by the explanation of their seeing him. If they saw him by the supernatural opening of their inward eye, they ceased to see him by the equally supernatural closing of that eye. As for himself, there was no necessity for any *local* removal. He disappeared just as an audience would disappear from the view of a speaker upon closing his eyes. They would remain just where they were before. As before remarked, we know nothing about the relation of spiritual or angelic bodies to space.

§ IV. *Fourth Appearance.*

Mark 16: 14-18. Luke 24: 36-49. John 20: 19-29.

The next appearance mentioned was still on the evening of the same day, at Jerusalem: “And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for

joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them. And he said unto them, 'These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.'" Luke 24. 36-49.

Here we infer again the sudden and instantaneous apparition of our Lord. "And as they thus spake, Jesus *stood* (ἔστυν) in the midst of them." Nothing is said of his entrance by the door or in any other way. The first they know, he is there—they see him.

It is indeed true that the language of John is slightly different: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, *came* Jesus and *stood* (ἦλθε καὶ ἔστυν) in the midst, and said," &c. Upon this Dr. Robinson argues as follows: "The question here again is raised, whether this entrance of our Lord was miraculous? That it might have been so, there is no reason to doubt. He who in the days of his flesh walked upon the waters, and before whose angel the iron gate of the prison opened of its

own accord, so that Peter might pass out ;* he who was himself just risen from the dead ; might well in some miraculous way present himself to his followers in spite of bolts and bars. But does the language here necessarily imply a miracle ? The doors indeed were shut ; but the word used does not of itself signify that they were bolted or fastened. The object no doubt was, to prevent access to spies from the Jews ; or also to guard themselves from the danger of being arrested ; and both these objects might perhaps have been as effectually accomplished by a watch at or before the door. Nor do the words used of our Lord strictly indicate any thing miraculous. We do not find here a form of ἐφίστημι, the word commonly employed to express the sudden appearance of angels ; but, ‘ he *came* and stood (ἦλθε καὶ ἔστη) in the midst of them ;’ implying *per se* nothing more than the ordinary mode of approach. There is in fact nothing in the whole account to suggest a miracle, except the remark of John respecting the doors ; and as this circumstance is not mentioned either by Mark or Luke, it may be doubtful, whether we are necessarily compelled by the language to regard the mode of our Lord’s entrance as miraculous.”

In reply to this, we think it can be shown that the intimation of our Saviour’s “ coming ” in connexion with his “ standing ” in the presence of his disciples on this occasion, detracts nothing from the force of our previous reasoning in support of the miraculous character of his appearance at this time. Our argument, it will be observed, is built on the assumption that our Lord’s manifestations of himself from time to time to his disci-

* Acts 12 : 10.

ples during the forty days, were of the nature of the scriptural *angelophanies*. Now if it can be made to appear, that the use of the same phraseology is common in such narratives—that an angel is frequently said to “come,” even when he must have appeared to an internal vision—then it is clear that the weight of the objection drawn from the occurrence of this term in John’s account, is essentially impaired. Let the following passages speak for themselves on this point: Judg. 6. 11, “And there *came* ($\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon$) an angel of the Lord, and sat under an oak which was in Ophrah.” That this was properly the *vision* of an angel is to be gathered from its being said, v. 12, “And the angel of the Lord *appeared* ($\tilde{\omega}\phi\theta\eta$) unto him,” which we have already shown to be the *appropriated* language for this kind of appearances made to the inward perception. Dan. 11. 18, “Then there *came* again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and strengthened me.” Rev. 8. 3., “And another angel *came and stood* ($\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$) at the altar.”

Bringing with us, therefore, to this manifestation the evidence collected from the former ones, we are certainly authorized to conclude that the nature of it was the same with that of the former. And I would desire especial attention to this consideration, for I cannot perceive but that this fact must necessarily govern our interpretation of the incidents that followed. The opposite view to that which I am now defending, supposes that the body now exhibited was the veritable, unchanged body of flesh and bones which had been taken down from the cross and deposited in the sepulchre. Consequently, its advocates begin by denying that there was any thing miraculous implied by the phrase, “stood in

the midst of them," unless possibly it might be that our Lord, by his omnipotent will, opened the door, as the angel did the prison door when Peter was delivered. But if this were so, would not this miracle of itself have been worthy of record ?* We plant ourselves, however, upon the simple letter of the narrative as it stands. We contend that the plain, obvious import of the text is, that this appearance was sudden and supernatural. As they were convened together in a closed room, "Jesus stood in the midst of them." He made himself visible to them. And how was this but by the same process with that which he had before seen fit to employ, viz., the sudden development of an interior power of vision which

* Thus the writer of a review on my work on the Resurrection, in a recent number of the Princeton Repertory, remarks that "With only a moiety of Professor Bush's philological dexterity, and a tithe of his temerity, we could make it appear, that 'the language used of those events, is such as to be capable of being consistently understood without the implication,' that in the cases of our Saviour's appearance there was, on the supposition of a material body, any supernatural phenomenon at all. For instance, Jesus is said to have *stood in the midst of them*, the doors being shut. It is not said 'explicitly' that the doors were shut when he came in ; and how natural the conclusion, that while the doors were open he entered and sat ; and after the doors were shut, rose and addressed his disciples. Or on the other occasion, while the two disciples were relating the occurrences on the way to Emmaus, and at the table there, and Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, it is not said even that the doors were shut, and the presumption is allowable that he entered in the natural way. And as to his evanishing at the house in Emmaus, it was at the instant of the disciples' confusion, after their sudden and overwhelming discernment of him as their Lord, while their faces, *perhaps*, were hidden with astonishment, and their hearts "burning within them" with the lingering fire of his eloquence along the road, that he abruptly and silently withdrew, *they knew not how*."

enabled them to take cognizance of a spiritual body? What other supposition is possible, if he appeared to them without entering the room? Are we not, on the contrary supposition, compelled to infer that he came in his material body to the door, on the outside—that this gross body was instantaneously spiritualized that he might pass through it—and then as instantaneously materialized, that it might be seen and handled by the disciples? And is this probable? Possible, we may indeed admit it to be, and if we were cast simply for a solution on this text alone, we might deem ourselves perhaps shut up to the admission of this twofold miracle. But certainly, the weight of the evidence we have adduced in regard to the previous instances bears directly upon this. If he had formerly become visible in the manner suggested, why not now?

But how, it is asked, is this to be reconciled with what follows, Luke 24. 37–39? “But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.”

Upon this we are perfectly ready to concede, that the language taken by itself, in its simple letter, *would* convey the impression, which it is said by many is inevitable, that it was a material body which was now submitted to the test of the senses of the disciples. But let us recollect, on the other hand, the proof already adduced from the circumstances of the first appearance in the room, that the body was *not* material—that it required the opening of the inward eye to see it, for the simple reason that

it could not be seen by the outward eye—and then say whether it is credible that it was any other body which was handled than that which appeared in the midst of them, without coming through the usual avenue into the room.

But how could they touch and handle any other than a *material* body? To this let me say in reply, that no one is authorized to urge this objection so long as he admits the force of the evidence as to the real nature of the body which appeared. Did a gross material body instantaneously make itself visible in a closed room, or not?—for this is the hinge on which the whole matter turns. If we say it did, then we leave ourselves in apparent conflict with the plain purport of the text. If we admit that it did not—that it was a spiritual body which appeared—then we are not required to allow the force of any difficulty on this score, until it can be shown to be impossible, in the nature of the case, that Omnipotence itself could so order the phenomena of the manifestation, as to make a spiritual body to produce the same impressions upon the minds of the disciples that a material body would have done. I say it must be shown that it is not in the compass of divine power to effect this, before we can feel at liberty to set aside the previous evidence that the body which now appeared was not a body within the sphere of mortal or material conditions. Yet who can profess himself to have so completely mastered all the laws and attributes of spiritual existence as to be entitled to pronounce it impossible, that the celestial body of our Lord may have been made capable of presenting to the eyes or the hands of the disciples all the evidence that was really necessary to identify his essential person as now re-living and re-appearing on the earth? If there

is an inward spiritual *vision*, may there not be also an inward and spiritual *touch*? And if the consciousness of the subject cannot discriminate between the functions of the outer and the inner eye, may not the case be the same in regard to the touch?

But however this may be, we strenuously contend that the great object to be secured by the testimony of the disciples to the resurrection of Christ, was attained by their witnessing to the fact of such a body being manifested to them as *was* manifested; and what this was we are to gather, not from the language of a single isolated text, or incident, but from an intelligent survey of the whole history collated part with part. If, on the whole, the evidence seems decisive or preponderant that our Lord's body came out of the tomb a changed, spiritual, and celestial body, then the disciples witnessing such a body, confirmed the great fact of the resurrection; and though this fact were one that could be testified to only by the vision of a spiritual eye supernaturally couched, yet this does not invalidate the weight of the testimony. Paul was a true witness to the great fact of the Lord's resurrection, and yet he beheld only the glorious body of the Saviour, and that, too, with an inward instead of an outward eye. Why, then, may not the eleven have been equally unimpeachable witnesses, though we should suppose them to have seen only the same body that Paul saw, and to have seen it in the same manner? In what other sense, in fact, were they witnesses of the Lord's resurrection? They did not stand by and see the stone rolled away, and the identical body emerge from the sepulchre. This was not even seen by the Roman soldiers who were stationed to guard the sacred deposit, for when the angel descended they were overwhelmed and

struck down, and saw nothing. But if the fact to which the disciples were to be witnesses was the fact of the resuscitation and issuing forth of the material body, why was it not so ordered that they should have actually beheld it? The truth is obvious, that they were designed to be spiritual witnesses of the resurrection of a spiritual body.

This idea receives additional support from a recurrence to Paul's own language, 1 Cor. 15. 3-8: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." Now would any one infer from this that the *manner* of Paul's seeing the Lord after his resurrection was any different from that in which he was seen by his apostolic compeers? The expression is precisely the same in regard to the whole, and yet the hypothesis we are opposing makes it necessary to believe, that while *they* saw him in a material body, *he* beheld him in a spiritual one.

But still there is a lingering reluctance to admit a solution of the circumstances that *seems* to conflict with the strictness of the letter. Does not such a construction present Him who was the Incarnate Truth itself, in the light of an impostor, a deceiver, an assertor of that which was positively false? Does he not expressly say, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have"?

Undoubtedly he does, and what then? It is said that David saw an angel standing over Jerusalem with a drawn sword in his hand. Does it follow that that sword was made of steel, and that it was mounted with metals drawn from the bowels of the earth? Was not the sword of the same material with the arm and the hand that held it? "A spirit hath not flesh and bones." A spirit in their idea was a shadow, a phantom—something probably like a cloud or vapor, in exterior human form indeed, but with not even the *appearance* of the distinctive constituents of a human being. It was something which could afford no evidence of the substantial identity of a true person. The language of Job, 4. 15, 16, acquaints us with the ancient idea of spirits: "A spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes."

Now our Lord intended to teach them that in his case there was something more than this—that it was actually *he himself*, in the essential verity of his being, and if they would exercise the faculties with which they were endowed, they could not resist the belief that they were not conversant with a mere vapory ghost, like the airy spirits of Ossian, but their internal senses would report a veritable man. We say "their internal senses," because, as we conceive, it was in fact to these that the appeal was made. The phenomenon before them was of such a nature that it could not but have the effect of begetting the belief that they saw and handled that which was a real entity, and not a vague shadowy phantasm. This is, in fact, to be gathered from the very language itself; for it will be observed that he does not say in express terms, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as I

have," but—"as ye see me have," where the original is not the common word for "see" (εἶδετε), but another term (θεωρεῖτε), which implies more of a mental perception equivalent to our *consider, contemplate, apprehend*. A spirit hath not flesh and bones as *I seem* to you to have—as you *contemplate* me as having. We are well aware that the dissentients from our interpretation will here deny that any particular stress can be laid on the word θεωρεῖτε, as nothing is more common than the application of it to denote the ordinary vision of the natural eye. We readily grant that it is often so employed. Nevertheless we are not deterred by this from maintaining, that there is something in the legitimate import of the term, and in the circumstances of its frequent use, which goes to render it a peculiarly fitting word by which to express the peculiar idea designed to be conveyed in the present connexion. I find, for instance, on investigating the Septuagint usage, that in thirteen cases out of twenty-four, it is the term that answers to the Heb. רָאָה, which, as I have already remarked, is the more appropriated term for denoting *spiritual* or *prophetic* vision. Accordingly, as it implies more especially a *mental act*, it is defined in such cases by *contemplor, to contemplate*. Thus repeatedly in Daniel, "Thou sawest (ἐθεωρεῖς), O king, and behold a great image"—"Thou sawest (ἐθεωρεῖς) till that a stone was cut out without hands"—"I saw (ἐθεώρουν), and behold a tree in the midst of the earth"—"I saw (ἐθεώρουν) in the visions of my head upon my bed"—"I Daniel saw (ἐθεώρουν) in my vision by night"—"I beheld (ἐθεώρουν) till the thrones were cast down." So, in the New Testament, we have the following, John 6. 40, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which *seeth* (θεωρῶν, i. e. with an eye of faith) the

Son, and believeth in him, may have everlasting life." Ch. 12. 45, "And he that *seeth* (θεωρῶν) me, *seeth* (θεωρεῖ) him that sent me." Ch. 14. 17, "Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive because it *seeth* (θεωρεῖ) him not." That is, does not believingly apprehend him. We would build no more upon the use of this term than it will justly bear. Our grand position is by no means dependent upon the sense we have assigned to it in this connexion, and if any one shall contend that the philological evidence is too slight to allow of its being pleaded in our behalf, we will not debate the point with him. At the same time we conceive that the illustrative instances we have adduced are entitled to consideration. We cannot but think there was a *reason* for the use of this word rather than any other in the present passage.

We say, then, that the presentation, made not to the natural but the supernatural senses of the disciples, was that of a true human material body transmuted by the divine operative efficiency into a true human spiritual body, of such a nature, that when seen by the spiritual eye, and submitted to the spiritual touch, it would faithfully represent all the distinguishing attributes of the former structure. And who does not perceive how different this would be from the mere phantasmagoria of a ghost, bearing just as much resemblance to a man as a body of smoke that we might conceive to be wrought into a human form?

What, then, is to be thought of that most uncandid, unjust, and ungenerous of all imputations, that this language was practising a cheat upon the credulity of the disciples and all future readers of the gospel, if it did not teach that our Lord now appeared in a body of veri-

table flesh and blood? * Where was the deception? The design was to prove to the disciples that our Lord, as to the essential truth of his being, was risen, was alive, had appeared before them. For this purpose he exhibits the body which he had in the only way in which it was possible, in the nature of the case, that he could exhibit it, and to the only eye which could see it. And for this he is to be branded as an impostor, and those who maintain it, to be charged with attempting to raze the temple of Christianity and subvert its corner-stone! And is it indeed come to this, that the reverent attempt to discriminate between the letter and the spirit, and so to construe the word inspired as to bring out a sense which shall harmonize its *apparent* discords, and make one part chime in concert with every other part, shall be characterized and denounced as concentrating within itself the essential virus of profanation, blasphemy, and

* "On the supposition of our Lord's material corporeity, the deportment he assumed towards his disciples appears consistent with truth and honesty; on the other supposition it appears disguised and guileful. If he appeared in supernatural movements at times amongst his disciples, they could see such movements accounted for in the same manner as they long before accounted for his walking on the sea. They could call his movements miraculous, and be satisfied; for they knew, from other facts, that the power of working miracles was with him. But reverse the supposition, and although the unsuspecting ignorance and simplicity of his followers might have screened him, in their esteem, from the *reproach* of falsehood, yet the *fact* of deception would be there, and would have its corresponding principle within; a consequence on which we cannot think the Professor will insist. And the reproach of deceit must follow, for the material body was expressly asserted then, and how could it be afterwards denied without reproach? It is entirely consistent with truth, not to say all that is true; to assert what is false can be justified on no pretence of useful design."—*Princeton Repert.* p. 176.

infidel cavil ! And this language, be it observed, is held by those who are horrified at the thought that our Lord's words are to be literally understood when he says, "This is my body, eat ye all of it." Here, it seems, the Lord's body is to be interpreted *spiritually*, yet when mention is made of the resurrection-body, a far slighter accommodation of the language is to be set down as the undoubted offspring of a secret infidelity !

But let us look a little at the legitimate bearings of the principle which is here arrayed against us, and which forbids the least deviation from the rigor of the letter for fear we should make out the sacred writers the very Coryphæi of deceivers, and grand abettors of falsehood and fraud. It is said in this same narrative that Jesus suddenly "stood in the midst" of his assembled disciples, without any intimation of his entrance by the ordinary mode of ingress. The language is so worded as to lead irresistibly to the inference that this was an instantaneous apparition, supernaturally effected. So it has been almost universally understood, and so it will doubtless continue to be by the simple-minded. Does not this phraseology mislead the reader ? Is he not naturally led to put an entirely false construction upon the words ? But no—this is not at all objected to. There is no double-dealing here. And why ? Simply because the hypothesis of a material body requires that though the words plainly imply one thing, yet that they should *mean* entirely another. The language *suggests*, indeed, the idea of a miraculous entrance and appearance, but still we are bound to believe that he came in, as any other person would, by the door. This is the complexion to which it comes. The obvious sense is to be explained away. It is absurd to think that as our

Lord now entered in a material body he could have entered by any other avenue than the door.

So again, when it is said that three *men* appeared to Abraham when sitting in his tent-door at the cool of the day, we are, upon this principle, to account the word a deception because it subsequently appears that these *men*, at least two of them, were *angels*. Thus too, when it is said of the women that came in the morning to the sepulchre and entered in, "behold, two *men* in shining garments stood by them," we see not why this is not also a deception.

The fact is, if this principle be admitted it will make sad havoc of a large part of the sacred volume. Hundreds of passages might be adduced where it is obvious, at a glance, that the primary sense of the letter cannot be received as its genuine teaching. Take as an illustration our Saviour's declaration in John: "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Now it is obvious that the Jews who were present took this in its most literal sense, as referring to the temple built first by Solomon and afterwards rebuilt by Herod. Our Lord was actually *in* the temple at the time he uttered the words, and what should lead them to suppose that he meant any other? The Evangelist tells us indeed that he spake of the temple of his body, but there is no evidence that *he told the Jews that he spake of his body*, and it is evident, from the use which they made of the circumstance at his trial, that they still retained this impression, and that there was a sense in which they were misled. Nor was it till after his resurrection that the disciples themselves put the right construction upon his words. But will any one from this assert that our Saviour was a deceiver?

Yet why not, if the same charge is to be fastened upon him from the language employed in speaking of his body after the resurrection? Thus, again we read that "Enoch walked with God, *and was not*, for God took him." Enoch "was not." Does this mean that he ceased to exist, or simply that he disappeared from human view? "The Word was made flesh." Does this mean that the Word was converted *into* flesh, or simply that it became united with flesh? "He hath made him, who knew no sin, to be sin for us." Was Christ literally made sin? So with a multitude of other texts, where no one can hesitate for a moment to admit that some qualification of the literal reading is indispensably necessary.

In the present case it will be seen that the real point at issue is the *nature* and *mode* of the manifestation—or in other words, whether our Lord entered by the door, or suddenly appeared, without entering. If the latter be the fact, then doubtless the body which was handled was the body which thus appeared, and we leave it to the reflecting to judge whether this was likely to have been a material body of flesh and bones. Is not a supernatural handling, we would ask, just as conceivable as a supernatural seeing?

The same train of remark will apply also to his *eating* in their presence. There is no more difficulty in conceiving this, than in conceiving of their satisfying themselves by handling his body. It was part and parcel of the same process of identification. We hold that no one can seriously believe that our Lord subsisted by meat and drink during the forty days of his occasional sojourn among his disciples previous to the ascension from Bethany. Whatever, therefore, was the nature of the evidence afforded by his han-

dled body, such also was that afforded by his eating before them.

And in connexion with what is here said of our Lord's eating with his disciples, I beg leave to submit another passage which, taken in its several relations, seems to afford a still further proof of the correctness of the sentiment which I am here advocating. At the last supper with the disciples, our Lord remarked that "he would no more drink of the fruit of the vine till he drank it new with them in the kingdom of God." Luke, however, has it a little different—"Till the kingdom of God be come." Now the kingdom of God came, or was established, when Christ rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, and the evidence is to me conclusive that both these events—the resurrection and first ascension—took place on the same day, a point largely considered in my work on the Resurrection. Now it is expressly asserted by Peter that Christ both ate and drank with his disciples after his resurrection, and during the forty days. This I regard as the fulfilment of the promise here recorded. And if the idea be well founded, it is a proof that the kingdom of God was already established. But Christ is the King of this kingdom, and his glorification consists mainly in his investiture with the kingly dignity. Consequently if he ate and drank with the disciples *in his kingdom*, it must have been subsequent to his glorification. But he was not glorified in his material, but in his spiritual body. It follows, therefore, that he had a spiritual body when this eating and drinking took place.

As to what the disciples *supposed* was the nature of the substance submitted to their senses, this is entirely another question. The true inquiry has respect to what *it was* ; and this must be determined by an impartial esti-

mate of all the circumstances which enter into the relation. The evidence is to our minds conclusive, that the predicates are such as can apply only to a spiritual and celestial body. And if this be not the true view of the subject, to what extremities are we driven! If the resurrection of the Lord was simply the reanimation of his fleshly body, like that of Lazarus, what should have prevented his dying again? We may say, indeed, that God had *appointed* that he should no more see death, but the apostle's language undoubtedly is, that he had by his resurrection passed beyond the region where the *law of death* had any power: "Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The entire context from which this is taken, is so germane to our present scope, and contains such a striking confirmation of the soundness of our general view, that we cannot forbear to advert to it at some greater length. Rom. 6. 4-7: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." It is evident that he is running a parallel between the death and resurrection of Christ, and the death to sin and the spiritual resurrection of believers. The Scriptures teem with intimations that the resurrection of the saints is but the completed issue of their regener-

tion, and that this is linked by indissoluble bonds to the resurrection of Christ. When men are born again, they begin to live again, their old body of sin being put off as was Christ's fleshly body at his crucifixion. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead *by the glory of the Father* (διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Πατρὸς)." Here, then, is a plain intimation that there was something *glorious* in the resurrection of Christ, and some commentators render the phrase *in paterna gloria resurrexit*, *he rose in his Father's glory*, and if so, then certainly in a glorified body. However we may interpret it, there is clearly some intimation of a peculiar *glory* connected with his resurrection from the dead, and we see not why it does not respond to our Lord's own words before his resurrection, "Glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

Upon this glory we conceive him to have entered at his resurrection. But we rest not upon this alone. The apostle proceeds, Rom. 6. 8-11: "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now we would ask if any thing can be more obvious than that by the parallel here run, the apostle designs to imply that this spiritual and eternal life of Jesus Christ commenced at his resurrection—that he then entered upon that peculiarly spiritual condition which was the pledge of the spiritual and eternal resurrection life of his people. "If we have been planted," &c. Tholuck's remark upon this is as follows:

“The sense is this : By conquering death, Christ completed his terrestrial task, i. e. his existence in fellowship with humanity, burdened with the consequences of sin. As a risen Christ, he had already entered upon his exaltation, as he indeed appears not to have lived habitually upon the earth. In like manner we, so soon as we have in baptism acknowledged our sins and received pardon, are bound to arise to a new existence founded on heavenly-mindedness.” And why should not our Saviour’s spiritual life be manifested in a spiritual body ? If we understand by it merely the reanimation of his material body, the force of the parallelism is entirely destroyed, and what Paul says of the resurrection of our Lord ought to be applied to his ascension ; for on the opposite view it was at his ascension that this glory took its commencement.

The same inferences force themselves upon us from the tenor of the apostle’s reasoning in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, vs. 42–50 : “ So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption : it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory : it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power : it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural ; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy : the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy : and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood

cannot inherit the kingdom of God ; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Nothing is clearer than that Paul designs to set forth the conformity of our resurrection nature to that of Christ. It is in his resurrection state that Christ, the second Adam, stands in opposition to the first. In the one we see an embodiment of our sinful, corrupt, mortal nature, which the righteous put off incipiently at their regeneration, and wholly at death ; in the other we behold a glorious exemplar of that new created nature after which we are to be fashioned in our plenary resurrection. But Christ surely entered into this state at his resurrection, and not at his ascension. It is at the tomb of Joseph, and not at the Mount of Olives that we are to look for the first manifestation of the model of our resurrection bodies.

Again, permit me to refer to a passage in Peter, which can scarcely be viewed otherwise than as bearing directly on the point before us : " For Christ, also, hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, *being put to death in the flesh* (σαρκί), *but quickened by the Spirit* (πνεύματι)," or, as the clauses are perfectly balanced in the original, " Being put to death *flesh-wise*, but quickened *spirit-wise*," there being no sufficient authority for the common rendering, " *by the Spirit*." Here is plainly a designed contrast of some sort between his being *put to death*, and his being *quickened*, and he was certainly quickened at his resurrection. He is never said to have been quickened in the flesh, and though I confess to the difficulty of assigning a precise import to the word " Spirit" in this connexion, yet I think at the same time the intimation is obvious, from the antithesis, that the *spiritual was predominant* in his resurrection. He came into a

spiritual condition ; and if so, why not into a *spiritual* body ? as otherwise the contrast is lost. If his material body was raised, why should it not be said he was *quicken*ed in the *flesh* ? But it is said he was quickened in the *Spirit*. Now *Spirit* here cannot mean either the human or divine soul or principle, because this did not die, and therefore could not be made alive. *Quickened spirit-wise* we think, therefore, must mean that he entered into a *spiritual body* ; his state became *spiritual*.

But we are still urged with objections. *If the material body did not rise, there was no resurrection in the case, for it was only the material body that died.* This is very plausible. But what is the doctrine that we are advocating ? It is not simply the resurrection of a body, or *the* body, but the resurrection of a *glorified body*. No one doubts or denies that the body which was deposited in the tomb was raised out of the tomb ; but the question is, in what *nature* it was raised—whether *material* or *spiritual*—whether *changed* or *unchanged*. This is the whole controversy ; and any advantage gained by this form of the objection is gained by a quibble, to which the gainers are welcome. I might make precisely the same objection to the ascension. You maintain that our Lord rose in a material body, remained in it forty days, and then ascended to heaven. I ask, *what* ascended ? The material body ? “ O no ; that was changed *in transitu*. He ascended in a spiritual body, but still we must say that the body ascended.” Very well, I say in like manner the body was raised a spiritual body, and you have no more grounds for maintaining that a body which was buried material, must rise material, than I have for maintaining that a body which mounted from the earth material must enter heaven material.

The cases are perfectly parallel, and the objection brought against the one holds equally in regard to the other. I repeat, that the whole controversy hinges on the question whether the body came out of the sepulchre *changed* or *unchanged*. If the latter, then such a body as it *was*, such a body it was *seen to be*, and it was seen by such an eye as *could* see it, and by no other.

But there is a single passage of Scripture which seems to array itself so emphatically against this construction that we cannot, in justice to the argument, pass it by unnoticed. When the Jews demanded a sign, "Jesus answered and said, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. But he spake of the temple of his body." This is considered as an explicit and decisive testimony that the same material body arose which was buried. We remark upon it, that this passage cannot be taken independent of the evidence already adduced that the body was actually *changed* in rising from the dead. And for the sake of the argument I will here suppose that that evidence is not absolutely conclusive. I will even grant that it may remain somewhat doubtful whether the texts cited do really convey the import contended for. Still here is the palpable fact that there is a large class of Scriptures which, by very strong implication, favor the idea of the resurrection of a spiritual body. Consequently we have an *apparent* conflict of testimony. Nothing, then, can be more obvious than that we are not at liberty to consider the force of the foregoing passages as of course annulled by the literal import of this passage. Every enlightened critic sees at once that he is called to consider whether, since the Scriptures cannot contradict themselves, there may not be some construction adopted which shall leave the truth

of each unimpeached ; and the question is fairly presented whether the resurrection of our Lord, in such a body as we have intimated, may not, without violence, be deemed the accomplishment of this promise ? His body hung upon the cross—it was taken down—it was deposited in the tomb—it did not remain there—it was, if I may so say, *resurrected*, and though a glorious change passed upon its conditions, yet is there any violence done to language in saying that the temple which was destroyed was built again ? Do we, even in our common parlance, when we speak of a building, which has been destroyed by fire or otherwise, being rebuilt, necessarily understand that it must be reconstructed of precisely the same materials as entered into the formation of the original fabric ? May it not be rebuilt of other stones and other wood—be newly beautified and enriched—and still in common discourse be called the re-erection of the former edifice ? Take, for instance, the very temple itself to which our Saviour's words had a verbal allusion. That temple had been rebuilt by Herod, and the Jews say, “Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days ?” In some respects, certainly, it was more glorious than its predecessor, and doubtless contained new materials ; yet who would have any difficulty in saying of it that the old temple was rebuilt ? May we not, in like manner, say of the temple of our Lord's body, that it was rebuilt in his resurrection, though in a more glorious form ?

On the whole, then, we are not able to perceive that this language, fairly interpreted, vacates the force of the evidence already adduced, that our Lord rose from the dead in a changed, sublimated, and glorified body in which he ascended to heaven—the body in which he

ascended to heaven—the body in which he still abides, as the light and splendor of the upper sanctuary, the grand magnetic centre of the clustering hosts of the redeemed, who are forever gathering around him in bodies like his own.

§ V. *The Language in which our Lord's Post-resurrection Appearances are described.*

We have had occasion, on a previous page, to advert to the language in which the ancient *theophanies* and *angelophanies* are described. We have adduced an array of evidence, that a certain form of expression is usually *appropriated* to these appearances. We have shown that the Greek term ὀπτομαι, in some or other of its forms, is the term for the most part employed for this purpose. We by no means deny that other terms are occasionally made use of by the sacred writers, nor do we question that numerous instances may be cited where ὀπτομαι is synonymous with various other terms for “seeing,” and denotes simply the common function of the visual organ. At the same time, the fact is not to be denied, that this is the *prevailing* term by which these phenomena are expressed, and equally certain is it, that the same term is *uniformly* employed in speaking of our Lord's manifestations of himself after his resurrection. We see not, therefore, why the inference is not legitimate, that those manifestations fall within the category of real *theophanies*; or in other words, why they are not to be regarded as purely spiritual phenomena addressed to a purely spiritual vision.* Of this the read-

* “Between ὁραν, and ἰδεῖν there is a middle term, ὀπτεσθαι. For it is referred, at the same time, to the object presented to the eye,

er will be able to judge from the citations which we now proceed to make. They will be seen to lead to some very important results in reference to what is usually understood by the second or personal advent of Christ, and the entire class of related announcements.

Acts 13. 30, 31, " But God raised him from the dead : and he *was seen* (ὤφθην) many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people."

Acts 9. 17, " And putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jesus that *appeared* (ὀφθείς) unto

and to the subject which sees or perceives. And hence it will appear why the word is only used in the passive and middle voice, and why it is not found in the present tense. For, as it does not denote the action of seeing, but the state of him to whose eye or mind the object is presented, the active form would not properly express this ; and therefore the word must be in the passive or middle voice : in the passive, when any thing is said to be presented, or to appear to our mind ; in the middle, when the thought is rather of some object presented to or fixed in the eye or mind, that we may perceive it. Whence also, it is put either in the past or future ; since the accurate notion of the word requires, that that must be regarded as to have been done, or about to be done, by which we are to arrive at cognizance. For the specific power of this word is not, that it denotes the action of seeing, but the state or affection of the mind, to which the object is presented. It differs, therefore, from the words βλέπειν, ὄραν, which denote the action of seeing, and from ἰδεῖν, which is referred only to the subject. Nor are passages wanting, in which this specific force of the word is evident. It is rightly said in Matt. v. 8, ὁψονται τὸν Θεόν, *they shall see God*, for this does not mean, that they shall actually *see* God, which could not be ; but that they shall *truly comprehend* him. The words intimate the felicity of those, who more accurately perceive and appreciate the wisdom, holiness, and love of God ; which felicity can only be realized by the '*pure in heart.*'"—Tittmann on the Synonyms of the New Testament.

thee in the way as thou camest) hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight."

This *appearance* was confessedly an appearance of our Lord in his glorified body, and made to the inward mental vision of the apostle. Compare v. 7: "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." As to Paul himself, though he says of this manifestation, "Have I not *seen* the Lord Jesus?" and, "last of all, he was *seen* of me also," yet that it was not with the outward eye is obvious from what is said above, and equally so from the other incidents of the narrative. A remarkable effect was in some way produced upon his natural organs of vision, as we are told, v. 8, that "Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand to Damascus." From the narrative we infer that there was an objective supernatural *light* that addressed itself to the outward senses both of Paul and his companions, but of which the effect was far greater upon Paul than upon the others, because he was temporarily blinded by it, which they were not. But in addition to this, Paul, like Stephen, saw with the mental eye the Saviour, and he alone saw him. His companions merely beheld the light and "heard a voice, but saw no man." He thus speaks of the incident, Acts 22. 11: "And when *I could not see for the glory of that light*, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus." This is not surprising, when in relating the circumstances he says, ch. 26. 13: "At mid-day, O King, I saw in the way a light from heaven, *above the brightness of the sun.*" Yet this, be it observed, is the appearance to the

description of which the word ὀπτομαι, is here as elsewhere applied.

Luke 24. 34, "Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto Simon."

1 Cor. 15. 3-8, "For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures: and that he *was seen* (ὤφθην) of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he *was seen* (ὤφθην) of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain at this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he *was seen* (ὤφθην) of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he *was seen* (ὤφθην) of me also, as of one born out of due time."

Acts 26. 16, "Rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have *appeared* (ὤφθην) unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which *I will appear* (ὀφθήσομαι) unto thee."

1 Tim. 3. 16, "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, *seen* (ὤφθην) of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

It must, we think, be admitted, that the probability is very strong that this is something more than a mere casual diction—that the term is one of peculiar significance in this connexion. We leave it, therefore, to the judgment of the reader, whether the use of the same term in the following passages does not carry with it an equiv-

alent implication as to the *kind* of vision which would be requisite for the purpose.

Matt. 28. 10, "Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid : go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there they *shall see me* (με ὄψονται)."

Matt. 28. 7, "Go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead, and behold he goeth before you into Galilee : there *shall ye see him* (αὐτόν ὄψεσθε)."

Mark 16. 7, "But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee : there *shall ye see* (ὄψεσθε) him, as he said unto you."

Acts 1. 3, "To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, *being seen of them* (ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς) forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Here the original word is ὀπτανόμαι, which differs but by a shade from ὀπτομα, in its passive sense.

In the following passage the term is applied to the *beatific vision* of Christ, the nature of which cannot be supposed to differ from that we are now considering.

Rev. 22. 4, "And they *shall see* (ὄψονται) his face ; and his name shall be in their foreheads."

We readily grant that these cases, taken by themselves apart from the usage which we have above established, are not decisive. But viewed in connexion with that usage, they are doubtless to be considered as yielding an important accession to the amount of proof.

From the point now occupied, as the result of the foregoing inductions, we advance another step in the application of this term, in a variety of texts, to that peculiar manifestation of Christ which is generally understood by his *second coming*. This, it is well known, is

regarded by the mass of Christendom as an event to occur within the sphere of the natural world, and one that shall be cognizable by the natural senses. It is supposed that when our Lord shall appear "the second time without sin unto salvation," he will be *personally visible*—that he will be as truly seen, throned on the clouds of heaven, as he was seen suspended on the cross. It is held, indeed, that he will then appear in a body of splendor and glory infinitely transcending its humble state on earth, but that still he will *be visible to the bodily eye*. And so also of the attendant bands of angels, it is supposed that they will come equally within the range of corporeal vision. The most express authority for this anticipation is believed to be conveyed in the words of the prophet-apostle, "Every eye shall see him."

Now, when we venture to express our entire dissent from this view, we trust it may not be regarded as implying a direct contravention of the plain averments of Scripture. We depart from the common apprehension on this subject, because we believe that that itself departs from the true meant design of the Holy Ghost. Not that our theory of the true scheme of the Last Things depends *solely* upon the interpretation of a single word. The evidence apart from this is abundantly sufficient to satisfy us that the received construction on these points cannot be the true one. But the genuine import of the leading term applied to this event, cannot be deemed of light moment in settling the inspired teaching respecting it, and we now propose to bring a variety of passages to the test of the sense which we think we have established in regard to ὀπτομαι as the dominant term for denoting a *theophany*

Matt. 24. 30, "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they *shall see* (ὄψονται) the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

"26. 64, "Nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter ye *shall see* (ὄψεσθε) the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

Mark 13. 26, "And then *shall they see* (ὄψονται) the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory."

"14. 62, "Ye *shall see* (ὄψεσθε) the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

Luke 21. 27, "Then *shall they see* (ὄψονται) the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory."

Heb. 9. 28, "Unto them that look for him *shall he appear* (ἑφθίησεται) the second time without sin unto salvation."

1 John 3. 2, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that when he shall appear (φανερωθῇ) we shall be like him, for we *shall see* (ὀψόμεθα) him as he is."

Rev. 1. 7, "Behold, he cometh with clouds ; and every eye *shall see* (ὄψεται) him, and they also which pierced him."*

* "The evangelist represents this as then going on, in the present tense (ἔρχεται), just as the predictions are frequently made by the Hebrew prophets. This identifies the subject with the prophecy of our Lord, Matt. 24. 30, Mark 13. 26 ; and as cited by our Lord at his trial, Matt. 26. 64, Mark 14. 62. Compare these with Dan. 7. 13, Acts 1. 2, 2 Thes. 1. 7-10. Whence it must follow, beyond all doubt, that the period here intended to be pointed out must fall within the

A strict parallel to this is to be read, John 19. 37: "Again another Scripture saith, They *shall look* (*ὄψονται*) upon him whom they have pierced," an allusion to Zech. 12. 10, where the words occur. In explanation of the true import of the phrase in this connexion we cite the following passage from the exposition of Daniel 7th, in the "Hierophant," March, 1843, p. 231-2:

"The grand question in debate evidently concerns the *nature* of the 'coming' which was still future when announced by our Lord and his apostles. Was it to be *real* or *figurative*; or rather was it to be *personal* or *spiritual*—a coming in *bodily presence*, or in *providential act*? On this head all doubt is of course precluded by the facts of history. The 'coming' of Christ in the visitation of Judea was not *personal* but *providential*. It was a 'coming' in *punitive power*, and the usage of the sacred writers in respect to this word evinces clearly, that no unwonted sense is ascribed to it in such an application. Thus, Ps. 101. 2, 'When wilt thou *come* unto me?' i. e. appear for my deliverance. Isaiah 35. 4, 'Behold your God will *come* with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will *come* and save you.' Isaiah 19. 1, 'Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall *come* unto Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence. Isaiah 26. 21, 'Behold, the Lord *cometh* out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth.' Psalms 96. 13, 'The Lord *cometh* to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness.' In these and multitudes of similar cases it is obvious that 'coming' is used to denote the *signal acts*

apostolic age; otherwise these interwoven and mutually confirmatory texts of Scripture must stand for nothing."—*Lee on Prophecy*, p. 299.

of Providence. Such a 'coming' was that which took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. And we may advert in this connexion to a remarkable passage in Josephus, (J. W. Lib. 5. ch. 6,) where in the account of the siege of that city by the Romans, he informs us that whenever a stone was discharged against the walls from a peculiar kind of engine, the watchman on the walls gave the alarm, and cried out, *ὁ υἱὸς ἐρχέται*, THE SON COMETH! The origin and import of this exclamation have baffled all the commentators. Whiston says 'What should be the meaning of this signal or watchword, or what mistake there is in the reading, I cannot tell. The MSS., both Greek and Latin, all agree in this reading, and I cannot approve of any groundless conjectural alteration of the text.' For ourselves, we strongly incline to the opinion that God so ordered it in his providence, that the prediction of our Saviour, grounded upon the vision of Daniel, should have become current in the lips of that generation, they scarcely knew how, and thus have formed itself into a testimony which they were made to utter against themselves. History affords us numerous instances where, upon the eve of the fulfilment of signal prophecies of Scripture, similar vague and floating impressions to that effect have strangely become rife among those who were to witness it. Whether this, however, be the true solution of the fact or not, still the fact itself is palpable, and remains in some way to be accounted for.

"We have thus, as we trust, established the position, that the phrase, 'coming of Christ,' or 'coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven,' was used in the popular parlance of that age to signify that stupendous demonstration of the power and providence of the Mes-

siah which was witnessed in the destruction of Jerusalem. We see, moreover, no room to question that this phraseology is to be traced back to the vision of Daniel, which we are now considering.

“This was in fact a ‘coming’ which came to be considered as *characteristic* of the ascended and enthroned Messiah; and therefore in this view of the matter John says, Rev. 1. 7, ‘Behold, he *cometh with clouds*, and every eye *shall see* (ὄψεται) him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth (or land) shall wail because of him.’ If this book, as there is ample reason to believe, was written prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, we see no difficulty in applying this language to that, a long since past event. It is the mere echo of the numerous declarations of our Lord himself, that he would *come* during the lifetime of that generation, and that the unbelieving Jews should both *see* his coming, not in person but in power, and should wail on account of it. Matt. 24. 30, ‘And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; *and then shall all the tribes of the earth (the land) mourn*, and they shall *see* the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.’ This, it will be recollected, is the very event of which he says, that ‘this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled,’ and ‘there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they *see* the Son of man coming in his kingdom.’ With the burden of this awful and sublime intimation John’s mind is full as he enters upon the inspired apocalypse of his glory, and therefore he bursts forth in the outset with a repetition of it, as if it were yet sounding in his ears from the utterance of the Lord’s own lips. A recurrence to the passage in its connexions will

evinced that it comes abruptly forth from a spirit laboring under the apprehension of the transcendent dignity and majesty of the Personage of whom he writes, and of whom he could say nothing so worthy as to re-utter the announcement familiar to the ears of that generation : ' Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him ! ' But as the ' coming ' was not personal, so the ' seeing ' could only be by the *mental* eye recognizing the indubitable signs and tokens of his stupendous operations. The very accompaniment of *clouds* by which this coming was to be distinguished, indicates a degree or species of *obscurity* contradistinguished from an open and visible apparition. A *clouded* coming is a *shrouded* coming, as far as the *person* of the comer is alluded to. If, then, the prophet of Patmos points us in these words to the very ' coming ' which the Saviour himself announced as to occur not long subsequent to his resurrection, and if that assurance was actually verified to the men of that generation, then, as the ' seeing ' in both cases must have been an *inward conviction*—a *realizing sense*—of the truth announced, so the remorseful ' wailing ' in the one case must answer to the bitter ' mourning ' in the other. And perhaps we are to recognize an *incipient* fulfilment of this oracle at a somewhat earlier date, although still subsequent to the Saviour's assumption of his glory, when it is said, Acts 2. 37, ' Now when they heard this they were *pricked in their hearts*, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do ? ' But the prediction received a complete accomplishment in the wailings of unavailing anguish, when the threatened wrath came upon them to the uttermost in the ruin of their city and polity."

And now we are prepared to submit the question, whether we have not, from this source, the strongest grounds for the conclusion, that the Saviour's second coming, the *incipiency* of which is to be referred in a more signal manner to the destruction of Jerusalem, (see "Resurrection," p. 285,) was to be an event accomplished in a *spiritual* and *providential* coming, and one that was to be witnessed only by the *spiritual eye*?* Does not this inference follow by inevitable sequence from what we learn of the nature of his resurrection-body, and from the character of his post-resurrection appearances? If that body was one which could not, when it rose, be discerned by the natural eye, have we any reason to think that it would become more visible at the time alluded to in these announcements? Was it then to undergo a miraculous change which should bring it within the range of matter and of a corporeal vision?

* "It may be proper to observe, that the *second* advent of the Messiah is not, like the *first*, confined to one single and precise period, but is gradual and successive. This distinction is founded in the reason of the thing. He could only come *in person*, at one limited time. He comes *in his power and providence* through all ages of the church. His *first* coming was then over, when he expired on the cross. His *second* commenced with his resurrection, and will continue to the end of the world. So that this *last* coming is to be understood of his *Spiritual Kingdom*, which is not one act of sovereignty, exerted at once; but a state or constitution of government, subsisting through a long tract of ages, unfolding itself by just degrees, and *coming* as oft as the conductor of it thinks fit to interpose by any signal act of his administration. And in this sense we are directed to pray, *that his kingdom*, though long since set up, *may come*; that is, may advance through all its stages, till it arrive at that full state of glory in which it shall shine out in *the great day*."—*Hurd's Discourses on Prophecy*, Sermon v., p. 123.

In reply to this we shall probably be referred to the narrative of the ascension, Acts 1. 9-11: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." We remain, however, unconvinced by this upon the same grounds on which we dissent from the popular apprehension of what is taught by the language of the Evangelists in regard to the "*seeing*" the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. We do not believe that the inspired record, rightly interpreted, conveys the idea which is ordinarily deduced from it. For this dissent we are prepared to give our *reasons*, and as they resolve themselves into a point of exegesis, we claim that our interpretation shall be pronounced upon according as it is sustained or not by the just laws of hermeneutics.

Our first remark is, that the event here set before us is to be regarded as the true fulfilment of the prophetic vision of Daniel, ch. 7. 13, 14: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." As we have previously descanted at large

upon this passage of the prophet, (Hierophant, pp. 207–212,) we cite the language there employed :

“ The words of the prophet are, ‘ I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man *came* (הִתְנַחֵם lit. *coming*) with the clouds of heaven, and *came* (הִמָּצֵחַ) to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.’ Here it will be observed that the original employs two different words for ‘ came,’ of which the only difference of sense appears to be, that the latter implies a *nearer approach* than the other, it being the Chal. term which generally answers to the Heb. נָגַח *to touch, to reach unto, to come in contact with*. It here undoubtedly denotes that kind of *coming* to the Ancient of days which would be connected with an actual *sitting down by him*, as a participator of his throne—an idea which is obviously favored by the Gr. ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασε, *he came as far as to the Ancient of days*, making the act equivalent to that indicated in the 110th Psalm, ‘ Sit thou at my right hand.’ In fact nothing can be more express in confirmation of this view than the words of the Evangelist, already quoted, respecting the ascension, Mark 16. 19 : ‘ So, then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, *and sat on the right hand of God*.’ This brings the language of Daniel, of David, and of the Evangelists, into perfect harmony in respect to the *commencement* of the Saviour’s kingdom. The other word is the more ordinary term to express the simple idea conveyed by our English ‘ came,’ by which it is rendered. The Greek has ἐρχόμενος, *coming*, which in fact is a very literal version of the original הִתְנַחֵם, as this is not a verb, but a present participle.

“ We have already remarked, in a previous paragraph, that the text itself affords no data for determining the *direction of the motion* denoted by the phrase—whether it were a motion of *ascent* or of *descent*. But the view above suggested of the *event* here shadowed forth, doubtless affords us a true clew to the imagery. That event we have endeavored to evince to be the Ascension of Christ, and this at once determines the question respecting the *direction of the coming*. He *came* from the earth, and ascended to heaven, in order to enter upon the scene of the vision. But in the description of such a scene, and such an entrance, the imaginary standpoint of the describer would govern his use of the terms employed. If he conceived himself to be stationed within the precincts of the heavenly conclave, or near it, he would of course say that he saw one like the Son of man *coming* in the clouds of heaven; whereas, if he were supposed to witness such an entrance to the angelic circle from the earth, from which the Saviour ascended, he would more naturally say that he saw him *going* to the Ancient of days. Now, in point of fact, the term employed is *coming*, and as the Spirit of inspiration seldom permits us to lose sight of the various points of relation between the predictions of the Old Testament and the fulfilments of the New, we cannot but regard it as a subject demanding, in this connexion, the strictest philological inquest, whether this be not the true interpretation of Acts 1. 11, ‘This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* (οὕτως ἐλεύσεται) in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.’ It is, we think, by no means certain that the sense put upon these words, by the mass of expositors, is the true one. The meaning may simply be, that this

same Jesus, whom they had now seen taken up to heaven, should so *arrive* (viz., in heaven) as they had seen him go towards heaven; for the vision of Daniel had announced just such an advent or entrance to the heavenly court."

If a return from heaven to this world had been intended, the expression would hardly have been *ἐλεύσεται*, *shall come*, but rather *ὑνελεύσεται* or *πάλιν ἐλεύσεται*, *shall come again*, as John 14. 3, "And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again* (*πάλιν ἔρχομαι*) and receive you to myself." 2 Cor. 2. 1, "But I determined this with myself, that I would not *come again* (*πάλιν ἔλθειν*) to you in heaviness." Ch. 12. 21, "And lest when I *come again* (*πάλιν ἐλθόντα*) my God shall humble me among you." The truth is, the original word (*ἔρχομαι*) is not confined in its import, like our English word "come," to denote simply *motion in one direction*. It is, by established usage, properly rendered interchangeably by *come* or *go*, according to its contextual position. This usage may be confirmed alike from the Old and the New Testament. Thus Gen. 18. 22, "And the men turned their faces thence, and *went* (*ἦλθον*) towards Sodom." Ch. 22. 3, "And (Abraham) rose up and *went* (*ἦλθε*) unto the place of which God had told him." Ch. 50. 18, "And his brethren also *went* (*ἦλθον*) and fell down before his face." Ex. 2. 8, "And the maid *went* (*ἦλθε*) and called the child's mother." Ch. 3. 16, "*Go* (*ἦλθὼν*) and gather the elders of Israel together." Ch. 8, "*Go ye* (*ἐλθόντες*), sacrifice to your God in the land." Num. 11. 26, "And they were of them that were written, but *went not out* (*οὐκ ἦλθον*) into the tabernacle." Luke 2. 44, "But they, supposing him to have been in the company, *went* (*ἦλθον*) a day's

journey." Mat. 19. 1, "And it came to pass that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and *came* (ἦλθε, *went*) into the coast of Judea beyond Jordan." Ch. 12. 9, "And when he was departed thence, he *went* (ἦλθε) into their synagogue." John 6. 17, "And (his disciples) entered into a ship, and *went* (ἦρχοντο) over the sea toward Capernaum." 1 Cor. 16. 5, "Now I will *come* (ἐλεύσομαι, *go*) unto you when I shall pass through Macedonia." Ver. 12, "Now as touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him *to come* (ἵνα ἔλθῃ, *to go*) unto you with the brethren : but his will was not at all *to come* (ἵτα ἔνθῃ, *to go*) at this time ; but he *will come* (ἐλεύσεται, *will go*) when he shall have convenient time."

These instances, which might be indefinitely multiplied, go strongly to evince that the verb ἔρχομαι is used equivalently to the Latin, *progredior*, *proficiscor ad*, denoting simply *an advance to a given point of destination* without respect to the *direction*, whether *to* or *from* another given point supposed to be occupied by the narrator. In the present case, we know of nothing to forbid the understanding of ἐλεύσεται in reference to our Lord's *progress*, *advance*, or *advent* to the place to which he was ascending. "He shall so *come* to heaven as ye have seen him go towards heaven," i. e. with the angelic convoy, and precisely as he was represented *coming* or *going* in the vision of Daniel. It was only thus that that vision could be fulfilled. It matters nothing, in our estimation, that all the commentators and translators have understood it and rendered it as implying *a coming again to the earth*. What is an opinion worth apart from the grounds and reasons on which it rests? If ἐλεύσεται is rendered *shall come again*, we demand the authority on

which it is done. We affirm that its genuine sense is, *shall come—come* in reference to the point of destination. This point is not to be gratuitously assumed. It must be determined by the relations in which it stands. In the present case, we contend that the visionary prediction of Daniel affords the true criterion of its sense. If that prediction was not accomplished in the Saviour's ascension to heaven, when was it accomplished, or when is it to be?

From all this the inference is obvious. There is no authority in the Sacred Scriptures for the prevailing anticipations of Christendom of a *second visible personal coming* of Christ. That is an event that was to be accomplished in the spiritual and not in the natural world. It *commenced* at the time when our Lord entered upon that administration of his glorious and eternal kingdom, the first signal act of which was displayed in the judgment visited upon the Jewish race in the destruction of their city and temple, and the entire subversion of their polity. It was, indeed, to be a *coming* distinguished by *stages*, of which, undoubtedly, the last and most glorious was to synchronize with the sounding of the seventh Apocalyptic trumpet, when the kingdoms of this world were to become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and when the New Jerusalem economy was to be established on earth—a period to the borders of which we have now arrived, and the prophetic characters of which afford the only clew to the remarkable features of the current age.

If it be asked how this view is to be reconciled with the teaching of a large class of texts in the epistles which speak of Christ's coming as a future event, and as apparently synchronical with the final consummation of all things, we answer that the event *was* future at the

time of the writing, because the epistles were written in the interval between the resurrection of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, to which these predictions respecting the *consummation* refer. As that was the *coming* to which our Lord alluded, so it was the same coming to which the apostles alluded. His sense is to be the criterion of theirs. They speak, therefore, as men who regarded themselves as on the eve of the second glorious manifestation of the Son of God, with his holy angels, and it is only by putting ourselves back into the posture of their minds that we can enter fully into the burden of their language. We are well aware of the munitions of prejudice behind which the common belief, as to the drift of these passages entrenches itself, and that a denial of this belief can scarcely be separated, in the minds of most Christians, from a total rejection of the authority of revelation in regard to the *Last Things*. Nevertheless, our conviction is an intelligent one, and built upon an interpretation of the record to the soundness of which we challenge the severest test. Its fundamental ground is, that our Saviour's predictions, Matt. 24 and 25, refer not to the "end of the world," as the phrase is usually understood, but to the "end of the age or dispensation" then existing, and which began to be brought to a close in the destruction of Jerusalem. This we hold to be an impregnable position so long as our Lord's own words, Matt. 16. 27, 28, are acknowledged as a portion of that word which cannot be broken: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man *coming* in his kingdom." Again, Matt.

24. 34, "Verily I say unto you, *This generation* shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." These texts and the connected prophecy we are constrained to regard as the parent stock of all the kindred apostolic announcements grafted upon them. It is in the light of these texts that we deem ourselves forced to interpret all such passages as the following :

Philip. 4. 5, "Let your moderation be known to all men.

The Lord is at hand."

Heb. 10. 25, "Exhorting one another—so much the more as ye see *the day approaching*," compared with v. 37,

"For yet *a little while*, and he that shall come will come, and *will not tarry.*"

Rom. 13. 11, 12, "Now it is high time to awake out of sleep : the night is far spent ; *the day is at hand.*"

1 Pet. 4. 5, "To him *who is ready to judge* both the quick and the dead." V. 7, "*The end of all things is at hand.*"

James 5. 8, 9, "The coming of the Lord *draweth nigh* : behold the Judge *standeth at the door.*"

Rev. 22. 10, "Seal not up the prophecy of this book, for *the time is at hand.*" V. 12, "And behold, *I come quickly*, and my reward is with me."

1 Thes. 3. 12, 13, "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love, &c.—to the end he may stablish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, *at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.*"

1 Thes. 5. 4, "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness, *that that day should overtake you as a thief.*"

1 Thes. 5. 23, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless *unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" It would appear from this

that the apostle anticipated this coming while the Thessalonians were *in the body*.

To our minds the evidence is conclusive that the event denominated the *Second Coming* of Christ was understood by the first believers of the Christian church as an event then just at hand, and that this expectation was legitimately founded upon the true tenor of our Lord's own predictions, which pointed primarily to the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of the Jewish polity. At the same time, we are equally firm in the persuasion that this coming was to elongate itself over a protracted period, and that at about this age of the world it was to be realized, in a still more signal manner, by the introduction of the New Jerusalem economy, which is just opening in an inward and spiritual form upon the nations of Christendom.

Conclusion.

WE now leave to the verdict of our readers the evidence adduced of the spiritual and glorified nature of our Lord's resurrection-body. It will be seen, we think, even if it should not be deemed demonstrative to their minds, that it has such a degree of intrinsic weight, that no one can be justly accused of precipitate rashness in embracing it, much less *denounced* as boldly impugning the testimony of inspiration. Even placing the subject on the lowest ground, it must be admitted that the question involves in its determination, a *balance of probabilities*, and who is he that shall magisterially assume to decide that only one view of the matter can possibly be true, and that to question it is to go in the face and eyes

of the clearest teaching of holy writ? This we must characterize as mere idle assumption—a vain *ipse dixit*—which will go for nothing with one who values assertions according to the *proofs* they contain, and not according to the confidence with which they are made.

I am reluctant to give much of a personal aspect to this discussion ; but it has been publicly charged upon the theory of the Resurrection advanced in my recent work, that among other gross errors it involves a denial of our Lord's true resurrection on the third day. How far such a sentiment-could justly be imputed to the *present essay*, I leave it to my readers to judge. But if it is not fairly chargeable upon any thing I have now said, so neither do I admit it to be legitimately drawn from any thing contained in my book. I have expressly stated that our Lord's resurrection was a *pledge* but not a *pattern* of ours. I have said, also, that “there are certain circumstances connected with our Lord's post-resurrection appearances which are not to be expected to find a parallel in the case of the risen righteous.” Again, I have remarked, that “from a view of the whole, we know not what resistance to offer to the conclusion, that our Saviour *rose from the dead in a spiritual body*, the same body in which he ascended to heaven. ‘The prominent passages usually relied on in proof of the resurrection of the material body, we have seen to be capable of a fair and unforced interpretation in favor of the opposite theory. This conclusion, thus sustained by a legitimate exegesis, is not to be vacated by our inability to define the precise relation that may be conceived to subsist between the former and the latter corporeity. Whether we are to recognize some hidden process of sublimation by which the one was transmuted into the other,

or whether the material fabric which the divinity inhabited prior to the crucifixion resolved into its constituent elements, and thus wholly laid aside upon the development of the spiritual structure, we are not, perhaps, at present competent to determine, nor is it essential to the establishment of our main position." This is certainly very explicit language. Now is it not perfectly obvious that the question in regard to the disposal of the fleshly body presses just as much upon the opposite theory as upon mine? My opponents hold that the same change which I affirm to have taken place at the resurrection occurred at the ascension, for they do not believe that a body of unchanged material flesh and bones ascended into heaven. I ask what became of the *material body*? If it be said it was supernaturally changed, like Elijah's, in the act of ascending, then I demand whether precisely that change could not have been effected by Almighty power at the resurrection as well as at the ascension? And whether the evidence is not preponderant that such was the fact? And have I not just the same authority for asserting that the body arose at the resurrection, though it arose a celestial body, as another has for saying that the body ascended at the ascension, though it ascended a celestial body?

Having alluded to the case of Elijah, let us look at that event for a moment. It will, of course, be admitted that Elijah's body, when he mounted from the earth, was a material body of flesh and blood. Did this body ascend into heaven? Every one knows that after rising to a certain distance from the earth the atmosphere becomes so much rarefied that it will not support respiration, and therefore life must be extinguished, for a man cannot live if he cannot breathe. It is evident, there-

fore, that according to the common course of things, the prophet's body must have speedily become a corpse ; and is there any good reason to believe that a dead corpse was taken into heaven ? And yet Elijah was translated from earth to heaven. What does this mean but that that which constituted the real man was now glorified, and made an inhabitant of the heavenly sphere ? In other words, that he went into heaven in a spiritual body. And was not this the body in which he appeared in company with Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration—an appearance which, we repeat, we have no reason to think was seen by the natural eye. His material body, therefore, must have undergone a stupendous change of some kind, and we have just the same reason to ask what became of it, as what became of the Saviour's body. If it was miraculously transmuted into the spiritual, then when the manner of this is explained, we will explain the rationale of the change through which our Saviour's material body passed in becoming spiritual, celestial, and glorious.

But I leave the subject with the expression of my own most assured conviction, that it is, in its varied and multiplied relations, a subject which is destined to rise ere long into a transcendent and absorbing import in the view of the Christian world. It is not a matter of mere empty speculation. It takes hold of the great doctrine of the future life. It bears down directly on the question of the relation of the present to the future mode of existence. Is man a spirit as well as a body ? Is his spiritual being, in its permanent and everlasting conditions, to be developed immediately upon the cessation of his physical life ? Is his translation into the world of spirits his true resurrection ? This is assuredly the great

question of questions—the grand commanding controversy of coming time, which, until it is settled, must eventually throw every other into the back-ground.

The principles of interpretation involved in this decision are of the utmost importance to the interests of revealed truth. The extent to which scientific induction is to be allowed to have weight in fixing the true import of the language of Scripture, is a point in regard to which we deem a controversy inevitable that shall agitate widely the Christian world. The *science of man* is as true a science as the science of the globe or the science of the stars; and while we have no doubt that its results will eventually assure themselves just as incontestably to enlightened minds as do those of Astronomy and Geology, yet their admission will be as strenuously resisted, and upon the same grounds, and by the same class of persons, as were those in the departments just mentioned. The rigor of the literal construction will not be relaxed through the honest but mistaken fear of conceding a perilous license in the mode of dealing with the divine oracles. But the discoveries and deductions of science will go on, despite of every protest or interdict, and they will command assent just in proportion to the evidence by which they are sustained. And here will come the warfare between these results and the *literal* statements of holy writ. On the one hand, it will be held, that every rational inference, whatever be its intrinsic evidence, is to be disregarded whenever it comes in conflict with what *appears* to be the import of the inspired word viewed on the surface. On the other hand, it will be contended that we are at perfect liberty to abide by the results of our discoveries when sustained by adequate evidence of their truth, and that this involves not the slight-

est disparagement of Revelation, for the simple reason, that the object of revelation is *moral* and not *scientific*, and therefore puts no bar in the way of the most searching inquest into the *verity* of things. Of this it does not profess to treat, in regard to man's body or soul, nor does it forbid the mind's resting with absolute assurance in conclusions which it feels to be absolutely certain. This will be substantially the issue, and we cannot but perceive, that it ultimately resolves itself into the question, how far we can affirm *positive certainty* of the results of science. It will no doubt be conceded that when we can safely and soundly pronounce results *certain, absolutely certain*, then we are at liberty to make this certainty the criterion by which to determine the sense of Scripture. But in the mean time what is the policy so prone to be adopted by the rigid literalists on this subject? It is but upon very few points that we can, in the nature of the case, attain to the degree of *absolute certainty*, such as we have in the mathematical sciences. We cannot affirm a positive demonstration of the truth of the Newtonian philosophy in regard to the solar system, but it accounts adequately for the phenomena, and the evidence is such that the mind reposes in it. So in regard to other branches of science, the evidence that sustains its inductions is of such a nature that the mind cannot but, on the whole, yield its assent, and yet it would be rash to claim that every vestige of doubt was precluded. Now what we say of this rigid construction of Scripture is, that it takes an undue advantage of the acknowledged defect of mathematical certainty, and opposes the verbal statements, on a particular class of subjects, in bar of conclusions which the mind would inevitably adopt were it not for the apprehended

sanctity of such statements. It is not the confronting of those conclusions by an opposite array of the same kind of evidence by which they are supported—it is not an enlightened striking the balance between conflicting probabilities—but a violent foreclosure of all deductions except on the ground of an *authority*, which it is sacrilege to question. The man of science, therefore, is pushed to the wall by the force of the literal dogma, and his position is the more galling from the fact, that his soul may reverence the *authority* from which the alleged dogma proceeds; and yet he recognizes the same *authority* in the science that he does in the revelation, because they both proceed from the same source. He is restive in this dilemma, and by only one method can be released from it, and that is by a clear definition of the precise object of Revelation—by establishing the position, that it does not profess to enunciate the *absolute truth* in matters that fall properly within the range of the human faculties. Consequently it not only interposes no restriction on the most unlimited freedom of inquiry over the whole field of creation, but its *literal* sayings are not to be cited in arrest of the deductions of a sound philosophy.

This, however, will not be a readily conceded point. It will be yielded only because it is extorted. The claim will be contested at every step, and hard names, of which *German rationalism* will be among the mildest, will be copiously showered upon its assertors. They must, doubtless, make up their minds, not so much to be confuted in the fair field of argument, as to be denounced—to have their reverence for Scripture called in question—to have their names cast out as evil—and various forms of odium invoked upon them. But Truth

—immortal Truth—knows not how to die under such assaults. Though “beat to earth, ’twill rise again,” and its final triumph will honor its humble friends, while its mistaken but well meaning opponents will inherit the mortification of knowing in the end, that they have pulled down what they had purposed to build up.

A P P E N D I X.

THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, THE MOST NOTABLE
EPOCH IN THE SACRED WRITINGS.

*Translated from the Fifth Section of a Latin Tract, "On the
Spirit of Prophecy," by the Rev. John Lightfoot, D. D., &c.*

By RICHARD ROE, Exeter, Eng.

HAVING made some observations on the departure of the Holy Spirit from the Jewish church, and on the manner in which it became inundated with corrupt traditions, it seems proper to add a few words on its unutterable and deservedly fatal desolation. When God visited his own habitation and city, the places formerly most chosen to himself, with an overthrow so dire and fatal, and when he thus cut off his peculiar people, formerly dear and beloved beyond all others, with plagues deadly and tremendous beyond all ever before inflicted on mortals,—it is not surprising that it should be painted in the most dark and mournful colors.

I. Of these, the principal, and that which chiefly affects both the eyes and the mind, is that this fall is described as if it were the fall of the universe, and the dissolution, in its last day, of the entire frame and mechan-

ism of the world. Such are these figures of divine oratory:—"I beheld the earth, and lo, it was *תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ* (*tohu vâbohu*) without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heaven were fled." Jer. 4. 23-25. You would think, that the whole world was relapsing into its pristine chaos and disorder; when these words signify nothing more than the perdition of that nation, land, and city, as evidently appears in the following: "I beheld, and, lo, Carmel was a desert, and all its cities were broken down, at the presence of the Lord," &c.

Matt. 24. 29, 30: "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven." These, you will say, plainly express the dissolution of the whole universe, and last judgment. But, consider well, among others, ver. 34, and they speak, without controversy, of the fall of Jerusalem alone: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

In the same style and rhetoric are these, 2 Pet. 3, 10:—"The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up," &c. Who would not, without all doubt, understand these words to speak of the conflagration of the world in the day of judgment? But compare Deut. 32. 22:—"A fire is kindled in my anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

Hag. 2. 6 : “ Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land.” Heb. 12. 26 : “ I will shake, not the earth only, but the heavens.” And observe, that, by the elements, are to be understood the Mosaical, Gal. 4. 9, Col. 2. 20 ; also of what times the apostle is speaking ; and then you will not doubt, that he speaks of the conflagration of Jerusalem, the subversion of the nation, and the annihilation of the Mosaic economy.

To these the words of the Apocalypse are parallel, 6. 12, 13 :—“ The sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell . . . and the heavens departed as a scroll when it is rolled together,” &c. Where, if you will observe the foregoing plagues, with which God, according to his most frequent threatenings, destroyed that nation : namely, “ the sword,” ver. 4 ; “ famine,” 5 ; and “ pestilence,” ver. 8 ; and compare these words :—“ And said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us,” &c., (ver. 16, 17,) with “ Then they shall begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us,” (Luke 23. 30,) it will sufficiently appear, that those phrases relate to the tremendous judgment and fall of that nation and city.

II. To this corresponds that form of expression, in which the day and time of that vengeance and fall is called “ the day of the Lord,” and “ the coming of Christ in the clouds, and with glory,” as if the discourse was on the final judgment.

Acts 2. 20 :—“ Before that great and terrible day of the Lord come.” Let it be observed, that Peter applies this prophecy of Joel to those times, and you will see, without a commentary, what he means by “ that day of the Lord.”

In the same sense 2 Thess. 2. 2 is to be taken—"as that the day of Christ is near at hand."—For the apostle there describes, in vivid colors, the apostacy about to come before the fall of the nation, and the Jewish Anti-christ about to be revealed.

Such, also, are Matt. 16. 28, and other similar passages: "There are some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." And 19. 28: "When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," &c. And 24. 30: "Then they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds," &c. And John 21. 22: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

So likewise, Heb. 10. 37: "For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."—James 5. 9: "Behold, the Judge standeth before the door.—Rev. 1. 7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds."—And 22. 20: "Surely I come quickly." And more of this kind, which all relate to the coming of Christ in judgment on the Jewish nation.

III. In further agreement of these phrases are those, in which the times preceding that fall are called *אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים* (*a'harith hayyâmim*) "the last days," or "last times:" that is, the last days or times of the Jewish economy and nation. For in this sense is to be understood that form of speaking in most places throughout the sacred volume, if not indeed in all. As in Isai. 2. 2; Hos. 3. 5; 1 Tim. 4. 1; 2 Tim. 3. 1; 2 Pet. 3. 3; and a multitude of others. I cite, as a witness, St. Peter interpreting the words of Joel, Acts 2. 17:—"In the last days I will pour out of my Spirit," &c. "This is now fulfilled," says Peter; and is not at all to be re-

ferred to the last days of the world, but to the last days of Jerusalem. Do you inquire, What are those last days of which Paul and Peter speak in 2 Tim. 3. 1, and 2 Pet. 3. 3? St. John answers [1 John 2. 18]. "Even now there are many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." See also 1 Pet. 1. 20: "Christ was manifested in these last times."

IV. In like manner, the times succeeding the fall of Jerusalem are called "a new creation," and "new heavens and a new earth." Isai. 65. 17: "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth." When? Read on, and you will find the Jews cut off and rejected, and thenceforward is that new creation, viz. the gospel world among the Gentiles. See also Isai. 51. 16.

The sense of 2 Pet. 3. 13, is the same. "But we, according to his promise, expect new heavens and a new earth:" that is, "the heaven and earth of the Jewish church and state are about to be burned up, and the Mosaic elements will be consumed by fire; but we, after this consumption, according to that promise by Isaiah, expect a new age, and a new creation, a gospel state among the Gentiles; in which a justifying righteousness will dwell, when those will be justified through faith, who were before very far from righteousness." So likewise Rev. 21. 1: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." And Rom. 8. 19, 20, &c., concerning the Gentile world panting and sighing for the birth of the new creation.

To this class belong also those passages, which speak of עוֹלָם הַבָּא (*olâm habbâ*) "a future world," referring to the times of Messiah. For the fall of Jerusalem was τέλος του αἰῶνος (*telos tou aionos*) "the end of the Jewish

age," (or that עולם, during which the Mosaic times were to continue, of which times, it is said, that they were to continue לעולם) and thenceforward was the beginning of a new world and age, under the reign of Christ, among the Gentiles; when all nations should submit to the sceptre of his gospel.

Such were the views, two centuries ago, of this eminent commentator: views, which are now treated as novelties by those who ought to know better, and who thus show the declension of Scriptural knowledge among us. It is, however, surprising, that such men as Lightfoot, Hammond, Whitby, and some others, who saw so far, were not led forward to see farther; or to perceive, that the legitimate extension of their own interpretations nullified those parts of the popular creed, which teach a future visible coming of Christ, a universal judgment, and a literal conflagration of our globe.

NEW WORK ON THE SOUL.

WILL SHORTLY BE PUBLISHED

THE SOUL;

OR,

AN INQUIRY INTO SCRIPTURAL PSYCHOLOGY,

AS DEVELOPED

BY THE USE OF THE TERMS, SOUL, SPIRIT, LIFE, ETC.,

VIEWED IN ITS BEARINGS

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY GEORGE BUSH.

Wiley & Putnam have for sale the following Works
by Prof. Bush:

THE HIEROPHANT, 1 vol., (price reduced,) . . .	\$1 00
VALLEY OF VISION; an attempted Proof (from Ezek. xxxvii.) of the Literal Return of the Jews,	0 25
PROPHETIC VISIONS OF DANIEL, Nos. 1 & 2, . . .	0 25

For Sale by Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway,
ANASTASIS; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection: in
which it is shown that the Doctrine of the Resurrec-
tion of the Body is not sanctioned by Reason or Reve-
lation. By GEORGE BUSH, Professor of Hebrew, N.
Y. University. SECOND EDITION. 1 thick vol. 12mo.,
well printed. \$1 00.

CONTENTS.—Introduction.—The knowledge of revelation pro-
gressive.—Part 1. The rational argument—Objections to the common
view—Distinction of personal and bodily identity—The true body of
the Resurrection, as inferred by reason.—Part 2. The Scriptural
argument—Preliminary remarks—The Old Testament doctrine of the
Resurrection—Onomatology; definition of terms—Examination of
particular passages—New Testament doctrine of the Resurrection—
Origin and import of the word “Resurrection,” as used in the New
Testament—The Resurrection of Christ—Examination of particular
passages—The Resurrection viewed in connexion with the Judgment
—The First Resurrection and the Judgment of the Dead—“The
Times of the Restitution of all things”—Christ’s “delivering up the
kingdom”—The conclusion.

“The author occupies an important station in the University of New York, and is advantageously known as a learned commentator on some books of the Old Testament. It would be wrong to depreciate either his attainments or his general orthodoxy; and all that the most earnest and careful exertion of his powers could enable him to do, he has evidently done, to recommend the sentiments unfolded in this volume. Much patient labor and uncommon ingenuity have been brought to bear upon it. There is also a spirit that cannot fail to be attractive—a spirit of candor and modesty, combined with independence. Educated young men, fond of novel and critical disquisitions, and students of divinity who are anxious to prove all things, will wish to make themselves acquainted with its contents.”—*London Baptist Magazine*.

“The deep and universal interest excited by the appearance of this most able work, has already demanded the issue of a second edition. The promulgation of the theory maintained so learnedly and cogently by the author, has given birth to a sharp and somewhat bitter controversy among theologians; and we are sorry to see that the ill-will engendered has, in some instances, led to the impeachment of the motives of the writer. This can never be justifiable, and is, in this case, most unfounded and unjust. No one who knows Professor Bush, will doubt for an instant the perfect conscientiousness of all that he has written or said: and the very strong and well-considered argument by which he supports his position, will require something more, by way of answer, than the aspersions to which we have alluded.”—*N. Y. Courier*.

“Professor Bush deserves the highest commendation for giving publicity to his views of this important Scriptural truth. These views differ widely from those commonly received by the religious world; and it is rare, indeed, to meet with the boldness which has been exhibited on this occasion. We believe the author must possess, in no common degree, that rare and precious quality—*fidelity to one’s own convictions of truth*, and we heartily commend the work to the philosophical and the pious.”—*N. Y. Mirror*.

“What we have read convinces us that Prof. Bush is a deeply-serious believer in the Scriptures, in the soul’s immortality, and in future eternal rewards and punishments, and his theories, if adopted, are not calculated to endanger any one’s spiritual interests.”—*Boston Recorder*.

“An able and learned work.”—*Christian Observer*.